



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 111

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1965

No. 79

Senate

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, God: Bowing for a hal-
lowed moment at this shrine of Thy
grace, we acknowledge before Thee that
too often our lives are restless pools, that
we frequent so little with our spirits the
green pastures and the still waters.

In the social turmoil of our times, for-
give us that our minds, burdened by
many anxieties, are tempted to cynicism,
by human perversity and cruelty, and
that we become disheartened and dis-
illusioned by human folly which seems to
profit so little by bitter reaping.

So we look upward in our morning
prayer that in a continued sense of Thy
presence we may be delivered from the
fret and fever of today's demands and
decisions and from the praise or blame
of men. As in these stern days we mo-
bilize our national strength, whether in
our own hemisphere or half a world
away, against the wrong that needs re-
sistance, and for the right that needs
assistance, may our America be true to
its starry ideals and to those in the gal-
lant yesterdays who, in every challenge
to the rights of men, have dared and
died to make men free. We ask it in
the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by
unanimous consent, the reading of the
Journal of the proceedings of Monday,
May 3, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the Presi-
dent of the United States was commu-
nicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one
of his secretaries.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS TO MEET MILITARY REQUIREMENTS IN VIETNAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 157)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the
Senate the following message from the

President of the United States, which
was referred to the Committee on Ap-
propriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I ask the Congress to appropriate at
the earliest possible moment an addi-
tional \$700 million to meet mounting
military requirements in Vietnam.

This is not a routine appropriation.
For each Member of Congress who sup-
ports this request is also voting to per-
sist in our effort to halt Communist ag-
gression in South Vietnam. Each is say-
ing that the Congress and the President
stand united before the world in joint
determination that the independence of
South Vietnam shall be preserved and
Communist attack will not succeed.

In fiscal year 1965 we will spend about
\$1.5 billion to fulfill our commitments
in southeast Asia. However, the pace of
our activity is steadily rising. In De-
cember 1961, we had 3,164 men in South
Vietnam. By the end of last week the
number of our Armed Forces there had
increased to over 35,000. At the request
of the government of South Vietnam in
March, we sent marines to secure the
key Danang/Phu Bai area; 2 days ago,
we sent the 173d Airborne Brigade to the
important Bien Hoa/Vung Tau area.
More than 400 Americans have given
their lives in Vietnam.

In the past 2 years, our helicopter
activity in South Vietnam has tripled—
from 30,000 flying hours in the first quar-
ter of 1963 to 90,000 flying hours in the
first quarter of this year.

In February we flew 160 strike sorties
against military targets in North Viet-
nam. In April, we flew over 1,500 strike
sorties against such targets.

Prior to mid-February we flew no strike
sorties inside South Vietnam. In March
and April, we flew more than 3,200 sorties
against military targets in hostile areas
inside the country.

Just 2 days ago, we dispatched Gen.
C. L. Milburn, Jr., Deputy Surgeon Gen-
eral of the Army, to assist U.S. repre-
sentatives in Vietnam in formulating an
expanded program of medical assistance
for the people of South Vietnam. We
are contemplating the expansion of exist-
ing programs under which mobile medi-
cal teams travel throughout the coun-
tryside providing on-the-spot medical fa-

cilities, treatment, and training in rural
areas.

The additional funds I am requesting
are needed to continue to provide our
forces with the best and most modern
supplies and equipment. They are need-
ed to keep an abundant inventory of
ammunition and other expendable. They
are needed to build facilities to house
and protect our men and supplies.

The entire \$700 million is for this fis-
cal year.

The Secretary of Defense will today
support this request before the appro-
priate congressional committees.

Nor can I guarantee this will be the
last request. If our need expands I will
turn again to the Congress. For we will
do whatever must be done to ensure the
safety of South Vietnam from aggres-
sion. This is the firm and irrevocable
commitment of our people and Nation.

I have reviewed the situation in Viet-
nam many times with the Congress, the
American people and the world. South
Vietnam has been attacked by North
Vietnam. It has asked our help. We are
giving that help because our commit-
ments, our principles and our national
interest demand it.

This is not the same kind of aggres-
sion with which the world has been long
familiar. Instead of the sweep of in-
vading armies, there is the steady, dead-
ly stream of men and supplies. Instead
of open battle between major opposing
forces, there is murder in the night, as-
sassination and terror. Instead of dra-
matic confrontation and sharp division
between nationals of different lands,
some citizens of South Vietnam have
been recruited in the effort to conquer
their own country.

All of this shrouds battle in confusion.
But this is the face of war in the 1960's.
This is the "war of liberation." Kept
from direct attack by American power,
unable to win a free election in any coun-
try, those who seek to expand commu-
nism by force now use subversion and
terror. In this effort they often enlist
nationals of the countries they wish to
conquer. But it is not civil war. It
is sustained by power and resources from
without. The very object of this tactic
is to create the appearance of an in-
ternal revolt and to mask aggression. In

8963

May 4, 1965

this way, they hope to avoid confrontation with American resolution.

But we will not be fooled or deceived, in Vietnam or any place in the world where we have a commitment. This kind of war is war against the independence of nations. And we will meet it, as we have met other shifting dangers for more than a generation.

Our commitment to South Vietnam is nourished by a quarter century of history. It rests on solemn treaties, the demands of principle, and the necessities of American security.

A quarter century ago it became apparent that the United States stood between those who wished to dominate an entire continent and the peoples they sought to conquer.

It was our determined purpose to help protect the independence of the Asian peoples.

The consequence of our determination was a vast war which took the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans. Surely this generation will not lightly yield to new aggressors what the last generation paid for in blood and towering sacrifice.

When the war was over, we supported the effort of Asian peoples to win their freedom from colonial rule. In the Philippines, Korea, Indonesia, and elsewhere we were on the side of national independence. For this was also consistent with our belief in the right of all people to shape their own destinies.

That principle soon received another test in the fire of war. And we fought in Korea, so that South Korea might remain free.

Now, in Vietnam, we pursue the same principle which has infused American action in the Far East for a quarter of a century.

There are those who ask why this responsibility should be ours. The answer is simple. There is no one else who can do the job. Our power is essential, in the final test, if the nations of Asia are to be secure from expanding communism. Thus, when India was attacked, it looked to us for help, and we gave it gladly. We believe that Asia should be directed by Asians. But that means each Asian people must have the right to find its own way, not that one group or nation should overrun all the others.

Make no mistake about it. The aim in Vietnam is not simply the conquest of the South, tragic as that would be. It is to show that American commitment is worthless. Once that is done, the gates are down and the road is open to expansion and endless conquest. That is why Communist China opposes discussions, even though such discussions are clearly in the interest of North Vietnam.

Moreover, we are directly committed to the defense of South Vietnam. In 1954 we signed the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. That treaty committed us to act to meet aggression against South Vietnam. The U.S. Senate ratified that treaty and that obligation by a vote of 82 to 1.

Less than a year ago the Congress, by an almost unanimous vote, said that the United States was ready to take all necessary steps to meet its obligations under that treaty.

That resolution of the Congress expressed support for the policies of the administration to help the people of South Vietnam against attack—a policy established by two previous Presidents.

Thus we cannot, and will not, withdraw or be defeated. The stakes are too high, the commitment too deep, the lessons of history too plain.

At every turning point in the last 30 years, there have been those who opposed a firm stand against aggression. They have always been wrong. And when we heeded their cries, when we gave in, the consequence has been more bloodshed and wider war.

We will not repeat that mistake. Nor will we heed those who urge us to use our great power in a reckless or casual manner. We have no desire to expand the conflict. We will do what must be done. And we will do only what must be done.

For, in the long run, there can be no military solution to the problems of Vietnam. We must find the path to peaceful settlement. Time and time again we have worked to open that path. We are still ready to talk, without conditions, to any government. We will go anywhere, discuss any subject, listen to any point of view in the interests of a peaceful solution.

I also deeply regret the necessity of bombing North Vietnam.

But we began those bombings only when patience had been transformed from a virtue into a blunder—the mistaken judgment of the attackers. Time and time again men, women, and children—Americans and Vietnamese—were bombed in their villages and homes while we did not reply.

There was the November 1 attack on the Bien Hoa Airfield. There was the Christmas eve bombing of the Brinks Hotel in Saigon. There was the February 7 attack on the Pleiku base. In these attacks 15 Americans were killed and 245 were injured. And they are only a few examples of a steady campaign of terror and attack.

We then decided we could no longer stand by and see men and women murdered and crippled while the bases of the aggressors were immune from reply.

But we have no desire to destroy human life. Our attacks have all been aimed at strictly military targets—not hotels and movie theaters, and embassy buildings.

We destroy bridges, so it is harder to convey the instruments of war from North to South. We destroy radar stations to keep our planes from being shot down. We destroy military depots for the infiltration of men and arms to the South. We patrol routes of communications to halt the invaders. We destroy ammunition dumps to prevent the use of explosives against our men and our allies.

Who among us can feel confident that we should allow our soldiers to be killed, while the aggressor sits smiling and secure in his sanctuary, protected by a border which he has violated a thousand times. I do not believe that is the view of the American people or of the Congress.

However, the bombing is not an end in itself. Its purpose is to bring us closer

to the day of peace. And whenever it will serve the interests of peace to do so, we will end it.

And let us also remember, when we began the bombings there was little talk of negotiations. There were few worldwide cries for peace. Some who now speak most loudly were quietly content to permit Americans and Vietnamese to die and suffer at the hands of terror without protest. Our firmness may well have already brought us closer to peace.

Our conclusions are plain.
We will not surrender.
We do not wish to enlarge the conflict.
We desire peaceful settlement and talks.

And the aggression continues.
Therefore I see no choice but to continue the course we are on, filled as it is with peril and uncertainty.

I believe the American people support that course. They have learned the great lesson of this generation: Whenever we have stood firm aggression has been halted, peace restored, and liberty maintained.

This was true in Iran, in Greece, and Turkey, and in Korea.

It was true in the Formosa Straits and in Lebanon.

It was true at the Cuban missile crisis. It will be true again in southeast Asia.

Our people do not flinch from sacrifice or risk when the cause of freedom demands it. And they have the deep, abiding, true instinct of the American people: When our Nation is challenged it must respond. When freedom is in danger we must stand up to that danger. When we are attacked we must fight.

I know the Congress shares these beliefs of the people they represent.

I do not ask complete approval for every phrase and action of your Government. I do ask for prompt support of our basic course: resistance to aggression, moderation in the use of power, and a constant search for peace. Nothing will do more to strengthen your country in the world than the proof of national unity which an overwhelming vote for this appropriation will clearly show. To deny and delay this means to deny and to delay the fullest support of the American people and the American Congress to those brave men who are risking their lives for freedom in Vietnam.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 4, 1965.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 339) to provide for the establishment of the Agate Fossil Beds National Monument in the State of Nebraska, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 510) to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of

tion of our natural resources. I have also found that when the State holds back and doesn't make any effort to participate, the Federal agencies generally go ahead and do those things that are necessary, without the direct participation of the State agencies. Often then, though we condemn the Federal agencies for trying to run the State's business, in many cases, the States themselves are at fault and we have no one to blame but ourselves. In some instances, I have found that the Federal agencies were happy to play second fiddle, when the State agencies are willing to take the leadership in some of these projects that pertain to our natural resources.

BRIDGING THE GAP

Let me tell you a couple of things that we have done in Nevada that seem to have bridged this gap between Federal and State participation.

Some years ago, the State engineer formed what we termed the Nevada Water Conference. To these annual conferences, we invite all of the State and Federal agencies in any way concerned with the land, water, forests, and other of our natural resources. Each agency is given an opportunity to describe briefly its activities during the past year, and its plans for the coming year. In addition, we always have a number of papers by experts in the field of water, land, and so forth. This water conference has been going on for 18 years, and it has done a great deal to coordinate the activities within the State. We know the people in the Federal agencies much better than we would have otherwise, and they know us better. This has brought about a good relationship.

GOVERNOR'S NATURAL RESOURCES COUNCIL

A few years ago, we organized what we called the Governor's Natural Resources Council. This is made up of some 13 State agencies concerned with our natural resources, together with 5 Federal agencies. Meetings are held quarterly and we have found this to be a great help in developing programs, both Federal and State.

Now I have spoken about Federal-State relationship. I think a similar relationship should be encouraged between the counties and the State. Naturally, there is contact between the counties and the State, but not nearly enough. In most instances, the counties wait for the State to come in, whereas it is my opinion that in many cases, the impetus should be at the county level.

I think it is obvious that understanding and coordination are basic requirements for successful resource development programs. The many needs of the American people, as related to the resources we enjoy, must be carefully coordinated by the Federal Government, by the States and by the counties and cities; and by an informed public. Then sound decisions can be made on how we can make optimum use of our natural resources.

GREAT ERA OF PLANNING

We are in a great era of planning. Certainly one principle is of basic importance in achieving the best use of our natural resources. Whenever possible we must think

methods to adjust the plan to the ever-changing community. This planning must be done by people who care about the area involved.

COUNTIES SHOULD HELP FORM RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PLANS

This leads me to the conclusion that the counties should take an active part along with the State and Federal agencies in forming our resource development plans. This means planning not only for recreation, or water development, but everything that concerns our natural resources.

People should be the benefactors of resource management programs, and thus should receive the major consideration in the development of such programs. The economic requirements of our people should be the fundamental criterion in our resource management decisions. The conflicts that arise are usually manmade, and result from misunderstanding, mistrust, and poor cooperation, rather than from any inherent difference between economic requirements and good resource management programs.

Certainly the situation here in Nevada has been greatly improved during the last decade, by the means I have described. I have heard it said that "when people can talk together they seldom stay apart." I think this is very true. However, coordination will never be effective until it is carried out at the local level. To obtain this proper coordination between Government, State, and county agencies requires that each should be familiar with the resource programs of the others. Then, too, officials must know which facets of resource planning programs can and should be carried out locally.

The last Congress will probably be best remembered for the conservation measures that were enacted into law. I want to mention only a few:

WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH ACT OF 1964

This act (Public Law 88-379) will support water research centers in all of the land-grant colleges and universities in the United States. It provides for allotments in the sum of \$75,000 for the first year, \$87,500 for the second and third years, and \$100,000 for each year thereafter to each of the land-grant colleges to assist each participating State in establishing and carrying on the work of a competent and qualified water resources research center. It further provides matching grants for each land-grant college and also matching grants and allotments to other universities, other than land-grant colleges.

This act is essentially a copy of the Hatch Act of 1887, as amended, which brought about the establishment of the agricultural research stations at land-grant colleges and State universities. It proposes to duplicate in the water resources field, what has been so successful in agriculture—with the establishment of water research centers.

The introduction of this legislation in Congress was the result of a recommendation of the Senate Select Committee on National Resources that was set up during the 86th Congress (1959). The committee found that by 1980 the U.S. water withdrawals would double those of 1954, and by the year 2000 the withdrawals would triple. It found that in 5 of the 22 water resources regions of the United States, full development of all available water resources would be required by 1980, if projected increases in population and economic activities are to be achieved. These regions were the South Pacific, Colorado River, Great Basin, Upper Rio Grande and Pecos Rivers, and Upper Missouri River.

The committee pointed out that these findings should not be construed as placing ailing upon the growth of population and economic activity in water-short regions. The technical, legal, financial and political problems involved in meeting future water

needs in these regions are considerable; but the public interest demands their solution.

The committee studies indicate that the means for solving these problems are certainly available: that if bold programs for construction of storage reservoirs, reclamation projects, flood control facilities, and other works now conceived by the agencies involved are carried out, and if new techniques for desalting, evaporation control and waste disposal, together with advances in the weather modification program, are applied, water adequate both in quality and quantity will be available.

The committee further stated that the first and most important step toward getting the job done is the development of increased public awareness and understanding of the Nation's water resource problems, their effect on the country's economy, and possible solutions.

One of the committee's recommendations was to improve water research programs where there are deficiencies in our knowledge, and to strengthen substantially the contribution that the universities can make to research and graduate education in water resources.

Here at the University of Nevada it is my job, as associate director of the Desert Research Institute, to head the Center for Water Resources Research. We will attempt to develop water research programs that will be beneficial to an arid State such as Nevada, and which will assist in bringing about a better use of our water resources.

It will be our aim to make sure that the county officials and other interested persons are well acquainted with these research studies as they are carried forward. In this way the people will be made more aware of the critical nature of some of our water resource problems, and thereby will better understand them.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND ACT OF 1964

I am sure that you are well acquainted with this new act (Public Law 88-578) and its importance to one of our fastest growing industries—recreation. When I was director of the Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, Governor Sawyer designated me to be the liaison between the State and the Federal Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. I became well acquainted with this program.

Under this act, matching funds will be available to provide outdoor recreation areas and facilities at State, local, and Federal levels. Such funds may be used to acquire, plan, and develop such areas.

I think you are familiar with the fact that this program extends through the State to the counties and cities for the development of recreation areas. And that before Federal matching funds will be available, the State must develop a 5-year master plan which will include the programs of State, counties, and cities as well as the programs of the Federal agencies.

INTERAGENCY COMMITTEE

Here in Nevada, in order to bring about a coordinated program, two very important committees were established. One was an interagency committee on outdoor recreation, composed of representatives of all Federal and State agencies, as well as representatives of the counties and cities that were concerned with parks and recreation. This committee can do much to assist the State planners in preparing a sound State master plan.

CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR OUTDOOR RECREATION

The other committee was called the Citizens Committee on Outdoor Recreation and has statewide representation from organizations interested in the development of our park and recreation program. This committee gives these interested citizens in such

organizations an opportunity to participate and be heard, and at the same time to become acquainted with the overall program.

I will not dwell on the Public Land Law Review Commission (Public Law 88-606); the Multiple-Use Act (Public Law 88-607); nor the Public Sale Act (Public Law 88-608), as I know they will be discussed during other sessions of this conference.

As Secretary Udall has stated, these acts will "bring our horse and buggy land laws into line with the jet-age facts of life."

STATE COMMITTEE ON FEDERAL LAND LAWS

In order for the people of Nevada to become familiar with the operation under these acts, and be able to properly give intelligent advice to the Public Land Law Review Commission, our State legislature has just passed an act that will allow our Governor to appoint a State committee on Federal land laws. The committee will be composed of representatives of banks and saving and loan associations; city and county governments; industrial management; labor; State board of fish and game commission; mining; agriculture and livestock raising; education; recreation and conservation; railroads and the general public.

This act will be administered by the department of conservation and natural resources, and moneys will be appropriated for a staff.

In conclusion, let me say that when we talk about the development and management of our natural resources, we are in reality talking about land, water, and people.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Internal Security of the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INCOME TAX RELIEF TO AMERICAN MILITARY PERSONNEL SERVING IN VIETNAM

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to represent the people of Arkansas in the Congress for more than 26 years. I still find that the most rewarding aspect of this high office is the opportunity to render meaningful

service to my constituents as well as to Americans all across the Nation.

A recent instance, which to me was most gratifying, was the President's announcement that income tax relief would be granted to American military personnel serving in the Vietnam Theater of Operations.

In an article by Jim Lucas in the March 16 Washington Daily News, it was pointed out that this tax relief had not yet been extended to our men in Vietnam. The article noted that Capt. F. R. Kendrick, a helicopter pilot from El Dorado, Ark., who may become the most decorated man in Vietnam, was seeking to have this relief made available to our men in Vietnam.

After looking into the situation, I immediately concluded that Vietnam came well within the precedent established in Korea where this favorable tax treatment was accorded to our servicemen. The hardships endured by our men in Vietnam are indistinguishable from those endured in Korea. Military combat is war, and no matter what we may call it, the action is no less hazardous and the bullets no less deadly even when we are engaged in an undeclared war as is the one now in progress in Vietnam.

On March 29 I directed a letter to the President urging him to exercise the discretion which he is given under section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code to designate Vietnam as a combat zone. I also spoke on the floor of the Senate to urge that Vietnam be designated as a combat zone under the Internal Revenue Code.

The President responded within a few short weeks with an Executive order retroactive to January 1, 1964, exempting enlisted personnel from all Federal income tax on pay received during assignment in South Vietnam or during service on naval vessels within 100 miles of the Vietnamese coast.

Commissioned officers may exempt from taxation \$200 per month of their service pay while on such assignments.

It is estimated that the exemptions will apply to approximately 32,000 Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps personnel in South Vietnam and several thousand Navy and Marine personnel aboard naval ships.

Mr. President, I was most pleased to have participated in this small expression of gratitude by a nation which owes much to the men who serve us so well in Vietnam today. It is one way by which all of us at home can recognize the good job our troops are performing—and the sacrifices they are making—in behalf of freemen everywhere.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to the President, proposing this action, and a copy of the Executive order granting tax relief for military personnel in Vietnam be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and Executive order were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

MARCH 29, 1965.

Hon. LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The President,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You will recall that Congress provided in the Internal Revenue Act of 1964 for excluding from gross

income certain pay received by members of our military forces while serving in a combat zone (26 U.S.C. sec. 112). Congress further provided that this section would become operative only upon designation of an area as a combat zone by the President of the United States.

As you know, such treatment was accorded our men who served in Korea, and it would seem equally appropriate to have similar benefits extended to those serving in Vietnam. The situation in Vietnam appears to come well within the precedent established in Korea, and most certainly the hardships endured by our men are indistinguishable.

I am aware that sensitive foreign policy questions are raised when an area is designated as a combat zone. It would seem to me, however, that we have a fundamental obligation to treat our servicemen in Vietnam with as much fairness as that extended to the men who served this country in Korea.

My attention was drawn to this matter by an article by Jim Lucas in the March 16 Washington Daily News about Capt. F. R. Kendrick, of Arkansas, who is seeking to have this tax relief made available to our men in Vietnam. The article notes that Captain Kendrick, a helicopter pilot, has been decorated three times by the Vietnamese and once by the United States.

With highest personal regards, I am

Respectfully yours,
JOHN L. McCLELLAN.

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

TITLE 3—THE PRESIDENT

Executive Order No. 11216: Designation of Vietnam and waters adjacent thereto as a combat zone for the purposes of section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954

Pursuant to the authority vested in me by section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, I hereby designate, for the purposes of that section, as an area in which Armed Forces of the United States are and have been engaged in combat:

Vietnam, including the waters adjacent thereto within the following-described limits: From a point on the East Coast of Vietnam at the juncture of Vietnam with China southeastward to 21° N. Lat., 108° 15' E. Long.; thence southward to 18° N. Lat., 108° 15' E. Long.; thence southeastward to 17° 30' N. Lat., 111° E. Long.; thence southward to 11° N. Lat., 111° E. Long.; thence southwestward to 7° N. Lat., 105° E. Long.; thence westward to 7° N. Lat., 103° E. Long.; thence northward to 9° 30' N. Lat., 103° E. Long.; thence northeastward to 10° 15' N. Lat., 104° 27' E. Long.; thence northward to a point on the West coast of Vietnam at the juncture of Vietnam with Cambodia.

The date of the commencing of combatant activities in such area is hereby designated at January 1, 1964.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 24, 1965.

[F.R. Doc. 65-4490; filed, Apr. 26, 1965; 3:11 p.m.]

May 4, 1965

9003

Enactment of the cold war GI bill during this session of Congress will offer to our heroic cold war veterans nothing more than what was offered to the brave men and women of prior conflicts—an opportunity to become intellectual and cultural assets in their communities. The cold war GI bill applies to all personnel who served for more than 6 months an active duty. It does not place a geographical limitation on bravery, dedicated service, and patriotism. Let us now resolve to grant a long overdue measure of justice and equity to America's cold war veterans—the men and women who remained ever alert and ready in the face of past crises, and who now man freedom's watch in Santo Domingo and throughout the free world.

Mr. President, let us grant these worthy Americans the unparalleled opportunity to gain useful education, and thus "make the hero and the man complete."

NEW BOOKS ON VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, two books which have been published recently cast much light on the situation in Vietnam. I refer to David Halberstam's "The Making of a Quagmire" and Malcolm W. Browne's "The New Face of War." Mr. Halberstam was a correspondent for the New York Times, and Mr. Browne is still a correspondent for the Associated Press in South Vietnam. Last year, both of them won the Pulitzer Prize for their fine work in reporting the news from that country.

Two reviews of these books have come to my attention. One review was written by Richard Dudman, the distinguished correspondent of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, who specializes in Vietnamese affairs. The other review, which was published in the May 2 issue of Book Week, was written by John Paton Davies, Jr., a former United States Foreign Service officer and author. I ask unanimous consent that these two reviews be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the reviews were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 29, 1965]
VIETNAM VETERANS ASSESS U.S. IN WRONG
KIND OF WAR

(Reviewed by Richard Dudman)

(Mr. Dudman has just returned from 7 weeks of covering the war in Vietnam for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.)

("The New Face of War," by Malcolm W. Browne; Bobbs-Merrill, 284 pp. \$5.)

("The Making of a Quagmire," by David Halberstam; Random House, 323 pp. \$5.95.)

One day at a press briefing in Saigon, a high-ranking American officer contradicted Malcolm Browne on some point about the war. The officer said that American military experience in Vietnam proved that the Associated Press correspondent was wrong. Browne's report was: "I have been here longer than any American military man."

He and David Halberstam of the New York Times, a handful of other resident correspondents, plus a larger group of reporters who arrived from time to time on temporary assignment, watched and reported the gradual loss of the war under the regime of President Ngo Dinh Diem, the phony strategic

hamlet program that was supposed to pacify the country, the fake victories that left the Vietcong guerrillas free to expand their control of the countryside, the false reports to Washington that all would be well and that the war was being won.

Their accurate reporting helped puncture the official line of "cautious optimism" and won them a shared Pulitzer Prize last spring.

Browne is still in Vietnam, now in his fifth year of reporting the war. Halberstam, in Vietnam from mid-1962 through 1963, has been transferred to Warsaw.

These are journalistic books, light on historical and political background and heavy on anecdote and factual detail about the war and the men who are fighting it (or in some cases not fighting it). Both were completed before the United States began bombing North Vietnam in February. Halberstam, anticipating the raids, suggests that they, too, will fail.

Browne's book, the cooler and more analytical of the two, begins with much factual information contrasting the expensive gadgetry of the American effort with the make-shift effectiveness of the Vietcong with their expert use of ambush techniques and their close and constant efforts to win support of the peasants.

He tells of an American Negro on "civic action" assignment who visited a hamlet and asked sympathetic questions and arranged to kill the rats, dig some wells and get a young man out of a scrape with officials. He was making some progress, unlike other civic action teams that stole chickens and ducks as they distributed propaganda pamphlets. But as the American captain was finishing his day's work, two South Vietnamese fighter planes swept in with rockets and cannon and destroyed half the hamlet on the basis of a report that guerrillas had been seen nearby.

Browne risks a few generalities. Of thousands of Vietnamese officials he has known, he says he can think of none who does not more or less hold the Vietnamese people in contempt. The feeling is reciprocated. As a result, he says, "I think it is safe to say that the average Vietnamese views the only good official as a dead one."

"When Vietcong terrorists publicly behead some hamlet or province official and then disembowel the wife and children as well, Americans tend to assume that this will result in a powerful reaction by the people against the Vietcong. Nothing could be farther from the truth in most cases. The Vietcong often liquidates a government official precisely because it knows such an act will please the local people."

He casts doubt, also, on the good personal relations supposed to exist between Americans and Vietnamese, warning that they are only skin deep.

"Most Vietnamese regard Americans as extremely gullible, politically infantile, and hypocritically, softhearted," he says. "For these things, they hold us in contempt, which in Vietnam is much worse than mere dislike."

Halberstam gives much space to the Diem regime and the slowness of American officials to recognize that it was losing the war while insisting it was winning. He portrays as leaders in an American policy of self-delusion the commanding general at the time, Paul D. Harkins; the American Ambassador, Frederick E. Nolting Jr.; the CIA Director in Vietnam, John Richardson; and Adm. Harry Felt, commander of U.S. Naval Forces in the Pacific, who once told Browne to "get on the team."

Halberstam also recounts in detail an attack against him and other correspondents in Vietnam by Time magazine and an effort by President Kennedy to persuade the New York Times to take him off the assignment.

Both men present masses of evidence showing that the United States still is losing in Vietnam because it is engaged in the wrong kind of war, against an enemy that has superior strategy and appeal, and on the side of a people who either can't or won't exert themselves effectively against the enemy.

Browne concludes that "there is a distinct possibility that this war may be lost." Halberstam considers Vietnam vital to U.S. interests but is no more optimistic. Neither recommends a pull-out.

Neither book will be read much in South Vietnam. The government there bans books about the current trouble.

[From Book Week, May 2, 1965]

THE BULL IN THE INDOCHINA SHOP

(By John Paton Davies, Jr.)

("The Making of a Quagmire," by David Halberstam; Random House, 323 pp. \$5.95.)

("The New Face of War," By Malcolm W. Browne, illustrated; Bobbs-Merrill, 284 pp. \$5.)

"This is a political war and it calls for discrimination in killing. The best weapon for killing would be a knife. The worst is an airplane." These were the words of an American colonel, one of our military advisers in South Vietnam, quoted by David Halberstam in "The Making of a Quagmire."

"This is a rifleman's war," an American officer said to Malcolm W. Browne in "The New Face of War," "and I'd be happy if they took every plane and every cannon out of the country. They do more harm than good."

Since these opinions of a year or so ago, our emphasis has moved even further away from the knife and the rifle. The combined American-Saigon forces in 1964 lost steadily to the Vietcong-Hanoi guerrillas, and approached disintegration and defeat. Early this year we therefore changed the terms on which war was being fought. We openly increased our air activity inside South Vietnam and launched a phased air offensive against North Vietnam.

That the conflict in Indochina entered a new—and no less baffling—stage does not make the Halberstam and Browne books out of date. The fighting on the ground will go on. And should we step up and extend our use of indiscriminate weapons, the ultimate decision will still remain on the ground, in the villages, essentially political in nature. Especially will this be true if hostilities spread farther northward to include China. So, what Halberstam and Browne have to say is significant not only historically but also currently, and perhaps even prophetically.

Although Halberstam's is a rather personalized narrative and Browne's account is more schematically organized, what they have to say on the main issues in that country is remarkably similar. Last year they shared a Pulitzer Prize for their reporting on South Vietnam, and now their books appear at the same time. Browne continues to cover Vietnam for the Associated Press; Halberstam is now reporting for the New York Times out of Warsaw.

In their books, the authors have pretty well limited themselves to reporting on the conflicts within their immediate ken. These were: The Americans and the South Vietnamese military versus the Vietcong, the Americans versus the South Vietnamese military, the Ngos versus the Buddhists, the South Vietnamese generals versus the Ngos, the young generals and colonels versus the older ones, the mountain tribes versus the lowlanders, the students against everyone but the monks, and the press against all in top authority, excepting Henry Cabot Lodge. In short, they focused on an American involvement in an Asian war between the states, in the midst of a profound and chaotic social

May 4, 1965

9004

revolution, complicated by a variety of alien intrusions.

Wisely, the authors avoided probing into other conflicts bearing on South Vietnam: Washington versus Hanoi, Hanoi versus Peiping, Hanoi versus Moscow, Washington versus Peiping, Peiping versus Moscow, Washington versus Moscow, Washington versus Paris, Phnom Penh and U Thant. Unfortunately, they neglected the possibility of Vietcong versus Hanoi.

For the average reader trying to figure out what goes on in South Vietnam, I would suggest jumping into the middle of Browne's book, starting with his eighth and ninth chapters dealing with the basic elements of the Communist revolutionary formula in Asia—and Africa and Latin America. Chapter eight tells the simple story of a village and how a Vietcong agitation team strolled into it, ingratiated itself with the villagers, gradually incited them against their own officialdom and Americans, slowly organized and involved them in guerrilla activities, ending up with the community functioning as a Vietcong stronghold.

Now these villagers did not consider themselves to be what we call them—Communists. Most of them, with a world-view barely extending beyond the horizon visible from the highest point in the settlement, regarded themselves as the rightful inhabitants of their parcel of countryside and as always menaced by artillery, rockets, bombs, or napalm hurled indiscriminately at them by their own Government's forces and by Americans. This uneasiness produced a feeling of alienation toward Saigon and Americans. And if one or several members of the family had thus been killed, the feelings were likely to be distinctly unfriendly. Thus the Vietcong-indoctrinated peasant came to be politically motivated—a nationalist in the sense of being anti-American and anti-any native authority that collaborated with the imperialist invaders.

All Vietnamese were aware that the Vietcong practiced terrorism. But such violence ordinarily did not affect the average man, unless he were suspected of helping the government and the Americans. For Vietcong terror usually was calculatingly selective, directed against officials, Americans and anyone who effectively advanced Saigon's authority. Since mass support is essential, the Vietcong tends to avoid indiscriminate terror as a primitive matter of strategy.

Both Halberstam and Browne view Saigon's and our battle for men's minds in South Vietnam as a dismal failure. Neither the South Vietnam government nor we, they conclude, have been able, with rare exceptions, to win the confidence of the villagers. Browne's account of two country boys, 8 and 9, being captured and gone over by government troops, and their stoic refusal to talk, reveals a little about the intensity of feeling and indoctrination of those we are fighting. The depth of this war for the Vietnamese, Browne reminds us, lies in understanding that, in one form or another, it has been going on for about a generation: "Men and women" revolutionary guerrillas have been meeting and marrying in the jungles of Vietnam for the last 30 years or more, fighting government forces side by side, and raising children to do just the same thing. For such families, revolution is not merely a campaign. It is a way of life."

Neither Halberstam nor Browne seem to have had much use for the top American command in Saigon—diplomatic, military or CIA—until Lodge arrived as a Yankee Brahmin placating Buddhists. Nothing is to be gained by rehashing here the acrimonious personal feuds within the American community based in Saigon, including Halberstam's fairly spectacular clash with the American brass because his reporting contradicted the official line. What does seem

important, however, is that events have confirmed Halberstam's and Browne's contention that our principal officials misjudged the situation in South Vietnam. It was not just three or four people—misjudgments during the past decade or two have tended to be impressively a matter of unanimity.

What happens is something like this: There is a crisis. So the facts, such as they are, are considered and a decision is made. This decision is then locked into policy—a process that at least minimizes, when it does not discourage, information contrary to or critical of that policy. In the case of Vietnam—everyone was on the team—we would sink or swim with Diem, and the war was going better every time the question was asked. To doubt this answer was poor judgment, "careerwise!" This pressure extended beyond government employees to include the press, culminating in President Kennedy's suave suggestion to the publisher of the Times that Halberstam be taken out of Vietnam—a request to which Mr. Sulzberger did not accede until his "young man in Saigon" had been awarded a Pulitzer Prize for the very reporting that the authorities had so objected to.

Both Halberstam and Browne argue that we misread the nature of the conflict, committing the classic blunder of trying to apply what worked in the Korean war to the new and quite different struggle in Indochina. We thought in predominantly military terms—and conventional ones, at that—when the war was basically a political one. Yet when the two authors try to come up with something constructive on this score, the best that they can do is to suggest, in essence, that we get into close rapport with the Vietnamese people. But what they persuasively have to say about the cultural, psychological and material gulf between us and the Vietnamese people makes their recommendations read like wishful thinking born of desperation. "Most Vietnamese," writes Browne, "regard Americans as extremely glib, politically infantile, and hypocritically softhearted."

In his final chapter, Halberstam makes an anxious summation of three supposed ways out of the quagmire: neutralization, withdrawal or the commitment of American combat troops. He rejects them all. He does not advocate—as President Johnson did last month—unconditional discussions with Hanoi, promising open-handed aid, which in the past has been bestowed upon those enemies who had to pay for it by submitting to unconditional surrender.

This economy-minded proposal of the President, leap-frogging the bloody, costly and uncertain interim endeavor to beat the Communists, moving straight into aiding North Vietnam, marks the beginning of yet another phase of our extraordinary misadventures in Vietnam. It makes Halberstam and Browne no more out of date than the bombing of North Vietnam did. Rather, it makes it more important that we understand how we got into the quagmire—and what its consistency may be.

ON ACCELERATING THE LANGUAGE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the situation which confronts us in Vietnam threatens the peace of the entire world. In such a situation, the United States needs to discuss its policy and alternatives in the most rational possible manner, without recourse to "blockbuster" name calling calculated to silence dissent.

Russell Baker, a highly respected journalist for the New York Times, made this point with skill and humor, in an

article entitled "Observer: The Paper Tiger Blues," published in the April 25 issue of the New York Times. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBSERVER: THE PAPER TIGER BLUES

(By Russell Baker)

WASHINGTON, April 24.—There are fat, warm rain clouds over the Potomac and the smell of war on the air. It is harder to think calmly. Tulips are bursting open and in the streets the girls go ungirdled. Troops moving. Marines engaged. With each fresh headline, you can feel the language being escalated.

They have begun to lob the big ones in. Words like honor, patriotism, appeasement. There is no defense against the big words. They are argument busters, debate enders. It is very risky venturing out with an un-Pentagon opinion once the language is escalated.

SMACK 'EM DOWN

Stand among the daffodils wondering if this war is absolutely necessary and the big-word boys zoom in and smack you with "appeaser," as Senator FULBRIGHT has just discovered. The latest pacifist demonstrators at the White House are no longer dismissed with the low-tonnage epithets, "innocent," "unrealistic," "unsophisticated," which hit the mark neatly without making a mess.

With the language escalation, they are now charged with promoting national dishonor, with weakening the President's hand or with giving comfort to Ho Chi Minh. Their patriotism is questioned. The aim at this stage is no longer to understand them, but to give them such a blasting that they will not dare to venture from under cover again.

VERBAL ESCALATION

This is still not total word war, however. In that stage they will be given a dose of the 2,000-pounders—words like "Communist stooges," "draft dodgers," "cowards," "traitors." This stage usually occurs when the casualty lists start to swell. The purpose of the escalation in its present limited stage is to encourage people to think less and emot more.

The process by which war is escalated in controlled stages is well understood, but nobody knows how language escalation is managed. One day, everybody is discussing the war threat very sensibly and saying there must be calm thinking; the next, by some mysterious process, everybody is shouting "honor," "patriotism," "appeasement" and "Don't weaken the President's hand."

This is a dangerous situation. Philosophers like Herman Kahn and Henry Kissinger have given us a clear understanding of how to control war. Thus far, the President and his men seem to have learned it so well that they can control the pressure in Vietnam as cannily as a good chef controls his oven temperature.

The lack of any controls on the language, however, means that the country may easily escalate into a big-word state of mind and slip into a froth of emotionalism just when the President wants to deescalate the war for diplomatic advantage. In that situation, the President must face the risk of being bombed with "appeaser," "dishonor," "traitor" and all those other 2,000-pounders that make it so hard for Presidents to reverse escalators.

Right now, however, it is every man for himself in Washington, and the pacifists are not gentler than the hawks. Evenings out are evenings of peril. You can never be certain which side the big words will fall from.

May 4, 1965

9021

Both political parties are pledged to carrying out the law as it is now written, and Congress has provided funds lavishly for the Department of Justice to enforce it. The people know that. The voting rights bill is merely a prelude to programs for housing, school bussing, and other demands of all kinds.

Mr. THURMOND. Would not the voting rights law be used as a pretext to obtain other programs that it will be said the people really want, in particular, programs to take power from the States and bring it to Washington?

Mr. STENNIS. Undoubtedly, that is the intent.

Mr. THURMOND. Were we not told last year that the passage of the civil rights bill, which is the most comprehensive bill of its kind ever passed by Congress, would bring to an end the need for civil rights bills, and that no more such bills would be needed? Were we not told that the racial question would be settled, and that there would be no more questions to be settled between the North and South? Were we not led to believe that if that bill were passed, it would bring an end to civil rights legislation?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. I believe that our friends from other areas of the country thought that that was correct. I believe they were truthful when they told us that. But now the situation has moved into an additional arena, and an attempt is now being made to force new patterns by political intimidation. I believe that is very clear, and that many people who did not realize it before, realize it now.

The important thing is that we must always remember to stay within constitutional powers and guidelines.

Mr. THURMOND. Does the Senator from Mississippi feel that the demonstrations are really attempts to coerce Congress into enacting more laws on the subject, in the hope that as a result, the power guaranteed by the Constitution will automatically be taken from the States and the people?

Mr. STENNIS. Undoubtedly the Senator is correct. When Congress assembled in January, facing many problems of our Government, both at home and abroad, these matters were not in that category. They were not in the field of operations, because enough law is on the books already, if a little time were allowed for it to operate.

The voting rights bill has been cooked up and scared up. We shall have to make a stand somewhere, sometime; otherwise this very problem will take over the country and abrogate the provisions of the Constitution.

Mr. THURMOND. The bill is entitled "A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States."

The 15th amendment provides:

SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Does the Senator from Mississippi believe that the voting rights bill has any connection with the 15th amendment? Could not the 15th amendment be enforced now, and is it not being enforced?

Is it not a self-executing amendment that can be enforced without further legislation, although we already have on the books a law to enforce the 15th amendment? No one is trying to deny the right of people to vote. Has not the bill other designs and purposes, as the Senator from Mississippi has brought out? Does not the Senator agree with me?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from South Carolina is correct. There is no need for the proposed legislation. There has not been time to appraise and put in motion the legislation that was recently enacted. The voting rights bill is merely a scared-up bill, one that has been proposed suddenly. It is a prelude to further efforts with respect to housing and similar programs.

The law is plain and simple. There are remedies. There has not been an opportunity for the civil rights law to operate.

Not only are we going entirely beyond the Constitution; we are going beyond reason.

Mr. THURMOND. Some persons have taken the position that the 15th amendment has the effect of nullifying, overriding, or abrogating article I, section 2, of the Constitution. I should like to hear the Senator's opinion on that.

Mr. STENNIS. Article I, section 2?

Mr. THURMOND. That is the section that gives to the States the right to fix voter qualifications. I know of no decision or precedent of any kind which holds that the 15th amendment overrides article I, section 2. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. STENNIS. It is correct. That is really not a serious consideration, unless it be one of temporary political expediency. The rule is clear; the cases are clear. I am fully satisfied that the operation of present law will bring about, in a short time, the result that was planned by the proponents of the previously passed civil rights legislation.

Mr. THURMOND. If the 15th amendment had had the effect of overriding or nullifying article I, section 2, of the Constitution, which reserves to the States the right to fix voter qualifications, would not the 17th amendment, which was adopted 40 years after the 15th amendment, and which contains verbatim article II, section 2, have the effect of revising the 15th amendment?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes; the historical facts are clear, plain, and consecutive, that there was no intent whatsoever to override the power residing in the States, originally with reference to voter qualifications; and there is machinery now in the Federal law, a law that has been upheld by the Supreme Court and is now in operation.

Mr. THURMOND. The courts have construed this point; and in 1959 the Supreme Court handed down the decision in the famous Lassiter case, a decision that substantiated the position that the States still have the right to fix voter qualifications. Is that not correct?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is undoubtedly correct. The law is clear on that. This is a bill that has been cooked up as a matter of expediency, in an effort

to obtain quick results and to meet the condition which exists in the streets.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, does the Senator feel that there is any conflict between article I, section 2, and the 15th and 17th amendments to the Constitution? Are they not all parts of the Constitution?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. THURMOND. Is there any conflict between them?

Mr. STENNIS. They blend together perfectly. The consecutive development of the parts of the Constitution, the history, and the legal procedures blend together as part of one package—and particularly in view of the passage of the last major Civil Rights Act. It really establishes a pattern, and will produce results.

Mr. THURMOND. Has the Supreme Court, or any State or Federal court, held in any interpretation that has ever been made that there is any conflict among the three?

Mr. STENNIS. I believe not. There has been a consistent line of decisions, even down to the very last decision, which sets forth a magnificent pattern of suffrage rights, the application of those rights, and now with the present law, the application of those rights is regulated under Federal law with infinite detail.

Mr. THURMOND. Does not the Senator feel that with all of the laws we have on the subject of preserving and protecting the right to vote, State laws and Federal laws, no purpose can be served by this bill at all, other than political expediency?

Mr. STENNIS. I believe that there is considerable political pressure behind the bill, rather than logic or need.

I believe that we cannot afford to take some formula as a substitute for discipline and self-improvement for all of us. We want to instill personal responsibility in citizens of all color. I cannot express it any better than that. I believe, from the statutes which are already on the books and clearly in the Constitution, that this is a matter of haste and a device to meet the marchers and paraders. These laws are already functioning in a fine way.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Mississippi for the great contribution he is making toward preserving constitutional government in the United States.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator very much for his courteous remarks, consideration, and his great assistance.

I shall now continue with my prepared remarks.

Section 4(b) of the bill now under consideration contains no express limitation which restricts its operation to enforcement of the 15th amendment prohibition against denials of the right to vote because of race or color. The simple recital that it applies only in States where more than 20 percent of the voting age population is nonwhite does not limit its coverage to prohibiting discrimination because of race or color. Given the existence of the statistical combinations set forth in section 4(b), the State or political subdivision involved

May 4, 1965

would be prohibited from administering a literacy test to any citizen. The prohibition would apply to whites or non-whites automatically, and clearly is not restricted or limited to preventing denials based on race or color. It cannot be contended that it is so limited. In this respect, it is similar to section 3 of the act of 1870 which the Supreme Court interpreted in the Reese case.

Mr. President, I have not concluded my remarks on this bill, but will do so at a later date.

I yield the floor.

We must look further, therefore, to determine if section 4 is limited by any other provision in the bill. Certainly it is not limited by section 2, which merely states a truism that no person shall be denied the right to vote on account of race or color. I submit that there is no other possible restriction on this provision; if this is true, S. 1564 cannot be considered appropriate legislation under the 15th amendment.

It has been contended by the Attorney General and others that the effect of section 4 is limited by the provisions of subsection (a) thereof which provides that a State or political subdivision which is subject to section 4 may file a petition for a declaratory judgment in a three-judge district court in the District of Columbia. Such a State or political subdivision may be removed from coverage if that court finds that:

The effects of denial or abridgment, if any, of the right to vote on account of race or color have been effectively corrected by State or local action and that there is no reasonable cause to believe that any test or device sought to be used by such State or subdivision will be used for the purpose or will have the effect of denying or abridging the right to vote on account of race or color.

At first glance, Mr. President, it may appear that this provision effectively limits the coverage of section 4(b), only to preventing denials based on race or color. It is true, of course, that section 4(b) will not apply to any State as to which determinations have been corrected. But what if the court does not find that such corrective action has been taken? In such case, the State or political subdivision could not require anyone to pass a literacy test. No action of the State would have to allege and prove that he had been denied the right to vote because of race or color; he could simply refuse to take a literacy test or comply with any valid State requirement which falls within the definition of "test or device" as set forth in section 4(c). It is, therefore, very clear that section 4(b) would not only prevent a State from discriminating against Negroes, but it would also prevent a State from applying any constitutionally valid test or device to anyone who attempted to register or vote, whether Negro or white.

There can be no question, Mr. President, that the effect of this provision is to apply to cases other than that of denying voting privileges on account of race or color. This provision of the bill would not prevent the nondiscriminatory use of literacy tests; it would simply prevent their use at all. The power to do this is not given to Congress by the 15th

amendment or any other provision of the Constitution.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a proposed unanimous-consent agreement and ask that it be read by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposal.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, that at the conclusion of routine morning business on Thursday, May 6, 1965, during the further consideration of S. 1564, debate on the amendment of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN] shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by Senator ERVIN and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]; that debate on the amendment to be offered by the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] and others dealing with the poll tax shall be limited to 4 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of said amendment and the majority leader, and that debate on any other amendment, motion, or appeal, except a motion to lay on the table, shall be limited to 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the mover of any such amendment or motion and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART]; *Provided*, That in the event the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the majority leader or some Senator designated by him;

Ordered further, that on the question of the final passage of the said bill, debate shall be limited to 8 hours, to be equally divided and controlled, respectively, by the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART] and the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]; *Provided*, That the said leaders, or either of them, may, from the time under their control on the passage of the said bill, allot additional time to any Senator during the consideration of any amendment, motion, or appeal.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. ELLENDER. I object.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that objection for a moment?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Obviously the Senate cannot be stalemated. There is work to be done, there are crises that confront the country. The business of the Congress must go on. The domestic program must continue. We cannot remain in a stalemated condition. Since the majority leader and I have discussed this matter rather fully, I thought we were bending over backward in being generous with respect to the amendments, particularly those that were most important, as to the time being allowed.

I had hoped, under the circumstances, that there would be no peremptory objection, and that if any Senator was dissatisfied with the allowance of time on such an amendment as the poll tax amendment or the Ervin amendment, which, of course, is vital, and which strikes sections 4 and 5 out of the bill, and with respect to the so-called observer-watcher amendment, a little time could be added, or time could be added on the bill when we finally reach the third reading.

I hope my distinguished friend from Louisiana might have a counterproposal to make. We certainly are not hide-bound about it, and thought we were being quite generous, after the discussions we had.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, four or five southern Senators have so far spoken on the bill as originally reported from the committee. The second substitute that we are now considering has been before us since just yesterday, and there has been no debate on it by the proponents, and very little by the opponents. I have not spoken yet, and the same applies to many other southern Senators who also desire to be heard on it. I think it comes in bad grace at this time for the leadership on both sides of the aisle to even suggest a limitation of debate. I therefore object to the unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection a little longer?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is there any way in which we could arrive at a more liberal time which would satisfy the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. ELLENDER. Not at this time.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT—SPECIAL APPROPRIATION BILL ON VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send a proposed unanimous-consent agreement to the desk and ask to have it stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the proposed unanimous consent agreement.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Ordered, that when the special appropriation bill on Vietnam requested in the President's message to Congress on May 4, 1965, is reported to the Senate, it shall immediately be made the pending business until disposed of; that there be five hours allocated to the debate thereon, including any amendments, and the time shall be equally divided between the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee or his designee; and that immediately upon the completion of the consideration of said bill, the Senate shall return to the consideration of the unfinished business, S. 1564.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1564) to enforce the

have a reduction in the number of positions.

Mr. GROSS. This then is the money that is used to finance U.S. participation in the International Labor Organization?

Mr. FOGARTY. It does not finance the participation; no. But it backs up the international labor movement.

Mr. GROSS. Then there is money in another bill for that purpose?

Mr. FOGARTY. Yes, in the State Department.

Mr. GROSS. I see. A subcommittee of which I am a member held some hearings early this year or late last year in connection with the International Labor Organization and it appeared then that the U.S. representation was quite dissatisfied with what is happening in recent international conferences.

Mr. FOGARTY. That is in the State Department appropriation bill.

Mr. GROSS. I suppose the gentleman is acquainted with the dissatisfaction on the part of the American representatives in that they are having trouble with delegates of the Communist-dominated countries and with sympathizers of communism from other countries? I would hope that this committee would keep a close check with a view toward cutting this appropriation further if this situation continues to get worse.

While I have the floor, I would like to ask the gentleman a question concerning, I believe it is, the Office of Equal Opportunity and the medical examinations of the individuals applying for training under this new setup. Is there any money in this bill for these physical examinations or is that to be found in some other bill?

Mr. FOGARTY. No; you are talking about the Office of Economic Opportunity—the anti-poverty program?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. FOGARTY. There is no money here for those purposes and we expect them to ask for any funds they need for personnel and any other services when they come before our committee in May—if the program is extended.

Mr. GROSS. I will say to the gentleman that I asked the question because I was amazed to learn the other day that where there is no veterans' facility or no USPHS facility to provide for Federal examination of applicants that local officials are authorized to pay as much as \$80 per person for examinations by private physicians.

Mr. FOGARTY. If they do that, it comes out of their appropriations and not out of this appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. But there is no money in this bill for that?

Mr. FOGARTY. No, there is no money in this bill for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7765) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I have permission to extend my own remarks and to include extraneous matter and tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules (on behalf of Mr. O'NEILL) reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 364, Rept. No. 283), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 701) to carry out the obligations of the United States under the International Coffee Agreement, 1962, signed at New York on September 28, 1962, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to reconsider.

PROCUREMENT OF AIRCRAFT MISSILES AND NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. BOLLING, from the Committee on Rules (on behalf of Mr. COLMER) reported the following resolution (H. Res. 365, Rept. No. 284), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7657) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation, for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to reconsider.

That after the passage of H.R. 7657, the Committee on Armed Services shall be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 800; that it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the enacting clause of said Senate bill and insert in lieu thereof the provisions contained in H.R. 7657 as passed.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY REQUIREMENTS IN VIETNAM—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 157)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:
I ask the Congress to appropriate at the earliest possible moment an additional \$700 million to meet mounting military requirements in Vietnam.

This is not a routine appropriation. For each Member of Congress who supports this request is also voting to persist in our effort to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam. Each is saying that the Congress and the President stand united before the world in joint determination that the independence of South Vietnam shall be preserved and Communist attack will not succeed.

In fiscal year 1965 we will spend about \$1.5 billion to fulfill our commitments in southeast Asia. However, the pace of our activity is steadily rising. In December 1961, we had 3,164 men in South Vietnam. By the end of last week the number of our Armed Forces there had increased to over 35,000. At the request of the Government of South Vietnam in

March, we sent marines to secure the key Danang-Phu Bai area; 2 days ago, we sent the 173d Airborne Brigade to the important Bien Hoa-Vung Tau area. More than 400 Americans have given their lives in Vietnam.

In the past 2 years, our helicopter activity in South Vietnam has tripled—from 30,000 flying hours in the first quarter of 1963 to 90,000 flying hours in the first quarter of this year.

In February we flew 160 strike sorties against military targets in North Vietnam. In April, we flew over 1,500 strike sorties against such targets.

Prior to mid-February we flew no strike sorties inside South Vietnam. In March and April, we flew more than 3,200 sorties against military targets in hostile areas inside the country.

Just 2 days ago, we dispatched Gen. C. L. Milburn, Jr., Deputy Surgeon General of the Army, to assist U.S. representatives in Vietnam in formulating an expanded program of medical assistance for the people of South Vietnam. We are contemplating the expansion of existing programs under which mobile medical teams travel throughout the countryside providing on-the-spot medical facilities, treatment, and training in rural areas.

The additional funds I am requesting are needed to continue to provide our forces with the best and most modern supplies and equipment. They are needed to keep an abundant inventory of ammunition and other expendables. They are needed to build facilities to house and protect our men and supplies.

The entire \$700 million is for this fiscal year.

The Secretary of Defense will today support this request before the appropriate congressional committees.

Nor can I guarantee this will be the last request. If our need expands I will turn again to the Congress. For we will do whatever must be done to insure the safety of South Vietnam from aggression. This is the firm and irrevocable commitment of our people and Nation.

I have reviewed the situation in Vietnam many times with the Congress, the American people, and the world. South Vietnam has been attacked by North Vietnam. It has asked our help. We are giving that help because our commitments, our principles, and our national interest demand it.

This is not the same kind of aggression with which the world has been long familiar. Instead of the sweep of invading armies, there is the steady, deadly stream of men and supplies. Instead of open battle between major opposing forces, there is murder in the night, assassination, and terror. Instead of dramatic confrontation and sharp division between nationals of different lands, some citizens of South Vietnam have been recruited in the effort to conquer their own country.

All of this shrouds battle in confusion. But this is the face of war in the 1960's. This is the "war of liberation." Kept from direct attack by American power, unable to win a free election in any country, those who seek to expand communism by force now use subversion and

terror. In this effort they often enlist nationals of the countries they wish to conquer. But it is not civil war. It is sustained by power and resources from without. The very object of this tactic is to create the appearance of an internal revolt and to mask aggression. In this way, they hope to avoid confrontation with American resolution.

But we will not be fooled or deceived, in Vietnam or any place in the world where we have a commitment. This kind of war is war against the independence of nations. And we will meet it, as we have met other shifting dangers for more than a generation.

Our commitment to South Vietnam is nourished by a quarter century of history. It rests on solemn treaties, the demands of principle, and the necessities of American security.

A quarter century ago it became apparent that the United States stood between those who wished to dominate an entire continent and the peoples they sought to conquer.

It was our determined purpose to help protect the independence of the Asian peoples.

The consequence of our determination was a vast war which took the lives of hundreds of thousands of Americans. Surely this generation will not lightly yield to new aggressors what the last generation paid for in blood and towering sacrifice.

When the war was over, we supported the effort of Asian peoples to win their freedom from colonial rule. In the Philippines, Korea, Indonesia, and elsewhere we were on the side of national independence. For this was also consistent with our belief in the right of all people to shape their own destinies.

That principle soon received another test in the fire of war. And we fought in Korea, so that South Korea might remain free.

Now, in Vietnam, we pursue the same principle which has infused American action in the Far East for a quarter of a century.

There are those who ask why this responsibility should be ours. The answer is simple. There is no one else who can do the job. Our power is essential, in the final test, if the nations of Asia are to be secure from expanding communism. Thus, when India was attacked, it looked to us for help, and we gave it gladly. We believe that Asia should be directed by Asians. But that means each Asian people must have the right to find its own way, not that one group or nation should overrun all the others.

Make no mistake about it. The aim in Vietnam is not simply the conquest of the south, tragic as that would be. It is to show that American commitment is worthless. Once that is done, the gates are down and the road is open to expansion and endless conquest. That is why Communist China opposes discussions, even though such discussions are clearly in the interest of North Vietnam.

Moreover, we are directly committed to the defense of South Vietnam. In 1954 we signed the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty. That treaty committed us to act to meet aggression

against South Vietnam. The U.S. Senate ratified that treaty and that obligation by a vote of 82 to 1.

Less than a year ago the Congress, by an almost unanimous vote, said that the United States was ready to take all necessary steps to meet its obligations under that treaty.

That resolution of the Congress expressed support for the policies of the administration to help the people of South Vietnam against attack—a policy established by two previous Presidents.

Thus we cannot, and will not, withdraw or be defeated. The stakes are too high, the commitment too deep, the lessons of history too plain.

At every turning point in the last 30 years, there have been those who opposed a firm stand against aggression. They have always been wrong. And when we heeded their cries, when we gave in, the consequence has been more bloodshed and wider war.

We will not repeat that mistake. Nor will we heed those who urge us to use our great power in a reckless or casual manner. We have no desire to expand the conflict. We will do what must be done. And we will do only what must be done.

For, in the long run, there can be no military solution to the problems of Vietnam. We must find the path to peaceful settlement. Time and time again we have worked to open that path. We are still ready to talk, without conditions, to any government. We will go anywhere, discuss any subject, listen to any point of view in the interests of a peaceful solution.

I also deeply regret the necessity of bombing North Vietnam.

But we began those bombings only when patience had been transformed from a virtue into a blunder—the mistaken judgment of the attackers. Time and time again men, women, and children—Americans and Vietnamese—were bombed in their villages and homes while we did not reply.

There was the November 1 attack on the Bien Hoa airfield. There was the Christmas eve bombing of the Brinks Hotel in Saigon. There was the February 7 attack on the Pleiku base. In these attacks 15 Americans were killed and 245 were injured. And they are only a few examples of a steady campaign of terror and attack.

We then decided we could no longer stand by and see men and women murdered and crippled while the bases of the aggressors were immune from reply.

But we have no desire to destroy human life. Our attacks have all been aimed at strictly military targets—not hotels, and movie theaters and embassy buildings.

We destroy bridges, so it is harder to convey the instruments of war from north to south. We destroy radar stations to keep our planes from being shot down. We destroy military depots for the infiltration of men and arms to the south. We patrol routes of communications to halt the invaders. We destroy ammunition dumps to prevent the use of explosives against our men and our allies.

Who among us can feel confident that we should allow our soldiers to be killed, while the aggressor sits smiling and secure in his sanctuary, protected by a border which he has violated a thousand times. I do not believe that is the view of the American people or of the Congress.

However, the bombing is not an end in itself. Its purpose is to bring us closer to the day of peace. And whenever it will serve the interests of peace to do so, we will end it.

And let us also remember, when we began the bombings there was little talk of negotiations. There were few worldwide cries for peace. Some who now speak most loudly were quietly content to permit Americans and Vietnamese to die and suffer at the hands of terror without protest. Our firmness may well have already brought us closer to peace. Our conclusions are plain.

We will not surrender.

We do not wish to enlarge the conflict.

We desire peaceful settlement and talks.

And the aggression continues.

Therefore I see no choice but to continue the course we are on, filled as it is with peril and uncertainty.

I believe the American people support that course. They have learned the great lesson of this generation: Whenever we have stood firm aggression has been halted, peace restored, and liberty maintained.

This was true in Iran, in Greece and Turkey, and in Korea.

It was true in the Formosa Straits and in Lebanon.

It was true at the Cuban missile crisis.

It will be true again in southeast Asia.

Our people do not flinch from sacrifice or risk when the cause of freedom demands it. And they have the deep, abiding, true instinct of the American people. When our Nation is challenged it must respond. When freedom is in danger we must stand up to that danger. When we are attacked we must fight.

I know the Congress shares these beliefs of the people they represent.

I do not ask complete approval for every phrase and action of your Government. I do ask for prompt support of our basic course: Resistance to aggression, moderation in the use of power, and a constant search for peace. Nothing will do more to strengthen your country in the world than the proof of national unity which an overwhelming vote for this appropriation will clearly show. To deny and delay this means to deny and to delay the fullest support of the American people and the American Congress to those brave men who are risking their lives for freedom in Vietnam.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, May 4, 1965.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow, or on a subsequent day this week, to consider a House joint resolution making a supplemental appropriation for the Department of Defense.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that the message from the President of the United States which has been just submitted will satisfy the Budget and Accounting Act as far as a budget estimate is concerned.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, that is certainly my opinion, and I am sure the gentleman is correct. This is a request for \$700 million by the President. It follows one of the procedures used by the Executive in submitting budget estimates and I consider this, and I am sure the gentleman does, a budget request from the President.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to state to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] that it was my understanding yesterday that before we considered this we would have a budget estimate. I wholeheartedly support the principle of following the regular procedure in seeing that these funds are appropriated, and if this satisfies the Budget and Accounting Act, I certainly would have no objection to its being considered either tomorrow or the next day.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

(Mr. MAHON asked and was granted permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO CONSTRUCT 17, 82-FOOT PATROL SHIPS

(Mr. BONNER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill in the amount of \$6,260,000 to authorize the construction of 17, 82-foot patrol ships that have been withdrawn from duty on the Atlantic coast, the Pacific coast, and the gulf coast to be sent to Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold hearings on this bill Thursday of this week and we hope to report the bill out of the committee and ask for immediate consideration this week, if possible.

This is an urgent matter for it leaves assigned duty of the Coast Guard on the gulf, Atlantic, and Pacific coasts without sufficient patrol ships, these coasts that will be faced with the withdrawal of these ships and the sending of them to patrol duty in joint utilization with the Navy.

Mr. Speaker, I could read the stations from which these ships are taken, but I shall insert in the Record so the Members of the House will know how serious this matter is at the present time, and it has been a serious matter for several years. On the New England coast, the Florida coast, the mid-Atlantic coast and the north Pacific coast the situation of the shortage of working materials for

the Coast Guard has existed for the past many years where there are supposed to be or are said to be Russian trawlers off these coasts. The Navy has issued a statement recently and it has been in the paper to the effect that these ships are not fishing trawlers but are observation vessels watching the activity of the U.S. Navy in various areas around our continental waters.

Mr. Speaker, I include herein the stations to which I earlier referred:

DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT

Construct 17 steel-hulled small patrol boats. These vessels to have a length of 83 feet 10 inches overall, diesel propulsion, maximum speed of 22 knots, cruising range at economical speed of over 800 miles, and all necessary electronics equipment for navigation and communications.

REASON FOR REQUEST AND RELATION TO LONG-RANGE PLANS OF COAST GUARD

These patrol boats are required to replace 17 similar boats deployed to Vietnam. To accomplish this deployment boats were taken from the following locations: Woods Hole, Mass.; Fire Island, N.Y.; Sandy Hook, N.J.; Cape May, N.J.; Norfolk, Va. (2); Fort Pierce, Fla.; Grand Isle, La.; Galveston, Tex.; Port Isabel, Tex.; Long Beach, Calif.; San Pedro, Calif.; Newport Beach, Calif.; Benicia, Calif.; San Francisco, Calif.; Everett, Wash.; Bellingham, Wash. This has resulted in a definite reduction of the Coast Guard search and rescue capability in these locations. With these replacements, the long-range plan for this type vessel operating off U.S. shores will be fulfilled.

NEED FOR ADDITIONAL PATROL VESSELS FOR THE U.S. COAST GUARD

(Mr. MAILLIARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I merely want to say that I join the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BONNER], in this matter and I too have introduced this authorization bill.

In addition to what our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from North Carolina, has said, I would like to point out we are now entering in the United States the peak of our recreational boating and the withdrawal of these seventeen 80- to 85-foot Coast Guard vessels is going to be a great blow to the preservation and the safety of the public. Certainly they ought to be replaced at the first possible moment.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Resolution 356 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 356.

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2985) to authorize assistance in meeting the

9070

initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed three hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments there to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 356 provides for consideration of H.R. 2985, a bill to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers. The resolution provides an open rule with 3 hours of general debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

H.R. 2985 would amend the Community Mental Health Centers Act to authorize financial assistance toward meeting the cost of technical and professional personnel serving in such centers during the first 51 months in which such centers, or new services in existing centers, are in operation. Such assistance is necessary to enable communities to establish or improve centers while completing arrangements for permanent sources of financial support.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to make grants not exceeding 75 percent of eligible staff costs in the first 15 months of operation, 60 percent in the first subsequent year, 45 percent in the second, and 30 percent in the third and final subsequent year. The bill only authorizes appropriations for 4 fiscal years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 356.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BROWN of Ohio asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden], explained this resolution or rule which makes in order the consideration of H.R. 2985 under an open rule with 2 hours of general debate and under the 5-minute amendment rule.

The bill itself is an amendment to the Mental Health Center Act passed by the Congress last year. This measure pro-

vides that the authority be placed with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make grants or gifts of some \$73,500,000 in total amount to the various local or regional health centers that are established throughout the country under the original act.

The funds would really be divided as far as the expenditure is concerned; \$19,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; \$24 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; and \$30 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968.

The funds involved would be used to start local or regional health centers—to staff them and obtain the expert and authoritative assistance needed to bring them into operation and help them on the way. Rather ingeniously, and I think very properly, the committee has provided that the percentage amounts of the grants to these health centers shall be reduced year by year, so that there will be every incentive to complete the staffing and establishment of operational facilities at the earliest possible date, while the Federal grants are available. This helps to insure that the facilities will be available for use as quickly as possible.

Now the bill itself has the unanimous support of all members of the great Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and was reported by a unanimous vote of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no opposition to the rule on this side and have no further requests for time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2985) to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of H.R. 2985 with Mr. VANIK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS] will be recognized for 1½ hours and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before the House today will provide for the use of Federal funds to finance a portion of the costs of professional and technical personnel utilized to staff community men-

tal health centers during the first 51 months in which such centers or new services in existing centers are in operation. The Federal share of the cost of these personnel is provided on a declining basis throughout this 51-month period and at the conclusion of the 51 months, no Federal funds will be available for the services at the centers covered. Grants under the legislation for the financing of these services thereafter will be the responsibility of the State or local community concerned.

Our committee held hearings on this legislation extending over 4 days, and considered it in executive session for 3 days, made a substantial number of amendments in the bill which strengthened and improved it, and ordered the bill reported to the House by a unanimous vote. The costs of the bill as authorized by the committee are set out in a table on page 3 of the committee report, and over the life of the bill will total \$173,025,000.

These amendments, however, will not be the total cost of the program, since it will be necessary for the administration to come back in 3 years and request an extension of the program, at which time we will review its operation and determine whether further changes are necessary in the program as a part of our reauthorization.

Members will recall that during the 88th Congress our committee considered the bill which became Public Law 88-164—the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963. This bill, considered in the 88th Congress, consisted of four titles. Title I dealt with problems in the field of mental retardation; title III dealt with the training of personnel for the teaching of mentally retarded and other handicapped children; and title IV contained general provisions.

Title II of that bill, as initially proposed, was in two parts. The first part provided Federal matching grants allotted among the States according to a Hill-Burton type of formula to assist in meeting a portion of the costs of community mental health centers. The second part of that title which proved extremely controversial and ultimately was deleted from the legislation provided Federal assistance in the staffing of community mental health centers constructed with assistance under the legislation.

At the time we held our hearings during the 88th Congress, it was not completely clear that Federal assistance in meeting the initial costs of staffing community mental health centers was necessary in order to provide for the construction and operation of these centers. Public Law 88-164 was signed by the President in August 1963. Under that legislation the States are required to submit State plans for the construction of community mental health centers and are required to establish programs very similar in overall structure and effect to the Hill-Burton hospital construction programs currently administered within the States.

The development and presentation of these plans and the approval thereof

tional cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the Michigan delegation to the Congress.

Adopted by the house April 1, 1965.

Adopted by the senate April 1, 1965.

BERYL I. KENYON,
Secretary of the Senate.
NORMAN E. PHILLO,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Through Foresight Now the United States Can Still Lead the World in Transportation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I have just read an excellent editorial in the Journal of Commerce for Friday, April 30 entitled "Clippers, Jets, and A-Ships." It makes a persuasive case for the need of the United States to have superiority in the field of international transportation.

The editorial calls attention to the leadership that came from the superior Clipper sailing ships saying that—

In the field of transportation, as nearly everywhere else, technical superiority makes for competitive superiority. It generates business. And it makes the going tough indeed for those who do not achieve it themselves.

Through the years, the International Air Transport Association has worked for the establishment of just and economic fares. From the beginning with the Bermuda agreements, fares have been constantly lowered. Efficient transportation and service has improved. Here is one of the fine examples of business and government working together. It has proven that competition can work and that free enterprise cannot only do a good job but is also interested in seeing that the public interest is served.

This is proof that American carriers have led the way and with our encouragement in the years that lie ahead, we will continue to lead.

The editorial follows:

CLIPPERS, JETS, AND A-SHIPS

In his book, "The Maritime History of Massachusetts," Samuel Elliot Morison gives a graphic picture of the China trades in the heyday of the American clipper ship.

"So vastly superior was the speed of the American clippers," he wrote, "that British firms in Hong Kong paid them 75 cents per cubic foot freight on teas to London against 28 cents to their own ships. Crack British East Indiamen humbly awaited cargo in the treaty ports for weeks on end, while one American clipper after another sailed proudly in, and secured freight almost before her topsails were furled. By the time the British builders were learning the first rudiments of clipper designing, the Americans had made further progress."

Those days are so long gone that many tend to forget the lesson to be learned from them. It is not merely that the U.S. clipper builders produced superior designs and gear. It is that in the field of transport, as nearly everywhere else, technical superiority makes for competitive superiority. It generates business. And it makes the going tough indeed for those who do not achieve it themselves.

In more recent years American aircraft manufacturers did much the same thing, as did the airlines that pioneered transoceanic flying, such as the scheduled service inaugurated between San Francisco and Manila in 1935 and then the transatlantic services that followed 4 years later.

Having achieved a notable lead they generated a good deal of business for themselves and have since acted as a powerful influence in keeping air fares low enough to generate even more traffic.

This is a point to be borne in mind when considering a problem as difficult as that posed by Alan F. Schoedel's definitive series of recent articles in this newspaper on prospects for a nuclear-powered American merchant fleet.

As a result of rapid technological improvements since the *Savannah* was completed in 1962, we are now close to the day when atomic-powered cargo liners can be acquired and operated at costs which would make them competitive, perhaps even economical, assuming that the Federal subsidy program is continued more or less on its present basis. A number are already under study. Estimates of how many could be profitably employed range anywhere from 50 to 150.

The greatest single advantage embodied in the nuclear merchant ship of the future is its speed. Operating at 30 knots it would enjoy an advantage comparable to that of the clippers in the China trade back in the 1840's. A less promising factor is the cost of building so many such vessels in relation to the seeming indifference of many legislators and some sections of the administration itself to shipping.

The real question, though, is not whether the United States can afford to embark on such a program. It is whether the United States can afford not to embark on it.

That the nuclear merchant ship is on the way is virtually certain. That the mercantile power first employing them in substantial numbers will get a great jump on its competitors is equally so. It is therefore unrealistic to assume that if the United States doesn't inaugurate such a program, that nobody else will. The technology available to American shipbuilders and operators is, by the very nature of things, also available to others, or will be in relatively short order.

So those in the industry, in Congress and in the administration who are pondering the alternatives must consider not merely whether the United States should invest in getting ahead of the field, but whether it should risk being left behind, and perhaps a long way behind. It can, of course, be argued that this country could begin turning out nuclear ships as soon as it became apparent that others were moving in this direction. But to hang back until others have taken advantage of the technical advances already registered here is to scuttle the opportunity to achieve a real lead. In other words, if the ships are ultimately to be built anyway, they ought to be built when their appearance will do the most good.

It is also important that American carriers who are in a position to render a superior type of service be given sufficient leeway in conducting their business to take full advantage of what they have to offer.

If the trend toward Government control of international freight rates continues, the advantages available to the more enterprising operators will be curtailed if not al-

together eliminated in the doubtful interests of uniformity. This goes not only for ships but for airlines. We are not speaking of the powers of all governments, including our own, to disapprove of international air fares, once they have been agreed through the International Air Transport Association. These are legitimate enough. But the bill now before Congress (H.R. 465) that would empower the Civil Aeronautics Board to prescribe precise rate levels unilaterally both for American and foreign air carriers serving this country on international routes is quite another matter.

The effect of this would be to make air fares a matter between governments. It would leave little scope for an enterprising airline. It would, in fact, leave little scope for enterprise.

College Tax Credit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. CLEVELAND

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, at the same time that post high school education is becoming ever more important, the cost of higher education is rising to the point where the average family is unable to afford it.

Our national concern with improving the quality and breadth of our educational system is a matter of record. We spend millions annually to improve facilities, broaden curriculum, and generally prepare students for better jobs and higher training. We do this because we believe in the value of an intelligent, aware, and capable population and because our national future depends on it.

Yet as we are increasing the opportunities, the group of students who are qualified but financially unable to take advantage of them, is increasing. An editorial in the Valley News, the daily newspaper of Lebanon, N.H., points out the increasing interest in a proposal which I have introduced in the Congress this session as H.R. 6025. The measure is designed to alleviate financial sacrifice and to encourage college attendance by giving a tax credit of 20 percent of the costs of tuition, fees, and books.

This is a grassroots Federal aid to education plan, helping where it hurts without necessitating expensive administration, the setting up of costly Government bureaus and offices. It is a simple way to ease the high cost of education and a small enough investment to make in the future of our Nation.

I commend this editorial which was published on April 17, 1965, to my colleagues and urge favorable action on tuition tax-credit legislation:

THE COLLEGE TAX CREDIT

Before President Johnson's college-aid program clears Congress, battle almost certainly will be joined on an issue which refuses to die—the college tax credit. The idea is a simple one: parents of college students would be permitted to deduct from their Federal tax payment the costs of tuition, books, supplies, and equipment. A maximum credit of

May 4, 1965

\$300 or \$400 is provided under most of the bills now before Congress.

Only with strong White House pressure was the tax credit scheme defeated in the last Congress. During Senate debate on the tax reduction and reform bill, one amendment setting up a tax credit plan was rejected by a 45 to 48 rollcall vote when three cosponsors voted against their own proposal, and a second was rejected by an even closer 47 to 47.

This year President Johnson has proposed that the Government set up a guarantee program for private loans to college students and pay part of the interest charge. This, he said, would be "a more effective, fairer and far less costly way of providing assistance than the various tax credit devices which have been proposed." But the Congress already is concerned over the high delinquency rate in the repayment of student loans under the present Defense Education Act.

The tax credit plan has the advantage of simplicity. One problem is that it would not benefit all taxpayers, most particularly those with incomes so low that there is no tax against which to take a credit. But sponsors say this is true of other tax relief provisions, and that this is a plan for the "average family" in America.

Many officials of private colleges favor the credit, but officials of State-supported schools are less enthusiastic, arguing that the plan would shift support for higher education from private endowments and public appropriations to the students themselves through higher tuition. Be that as it may, the tax credit plan has a solid following in Congress, especially among Republicans, and is far from dead.

Our Policy in Southeast Asia and Comments on the General Political Scene

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACKSON E. BETTS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. BETTS. Mr. Speaker, almost daily the news from Vietnam gets worse. There are those who cry peace at any price, but the professional pollsters report that the majority of the American people support a firm policy in southeast Asia. Yes, the people support continued opposition to the Vietcong, but my mail clearly indicates that they do not approve the President's proposal to spend \$1 billion in an effort to buy peace. Rather than to develop my own arguments on this point, I submit a letter from a constituent of mine. This good lady gets right to the heart of the issue and also includes some very pertinent comments on the general political scene.

The letter follows:

JACKSON E. BETTS,
Congressman, Eighth District, Ohio,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR JACKSON BETTS: After the President's speech of last night concerning Vietnam, I felt I should write you to let you know of my feelings. The political situation hasn't upset me enough to cry since election night. Perhaps you can tell me that I misunderstood the message; that my ears didn't hear what I thought they did, my eyes didn't see what I thought they saw. I thought I heard our President say if we gave our Asian enemies \$1 billion worth of goods and services, they would suddenly become peace-loving,

law-abiding brothers, be happy minding their own business, and leave all others alone. I thought I saw many people standing and applauding this idea as though it were a marvelous new innovation.

Ever since I was a little girl it has seemed tragic to me that there had to be so many evil people trampling over others. Wouldn't it be wonderful if everyone could and would love one another, be unselfish, and peaceful? What a beautiful world this would be. We hope things will be better for our children and better still for their children. Maybe someday these things can be. But they aren't now and can't be just because we wish them to be with the help of our money.

We work hard for the money the Government loves to throw away. It's our money, and I feel we should have some say about how it is to be spent. I'm sick of statistics that keep shouting how the average wage earner has half his pay left after essentials. We spend the first half for groceries, the other half for house, insurance, electricity, etc. And we are average. Maybe I can be a patsy for Washington bureaus that want to use my money to buy up farm surpluses so I have to pay more for the product at the store; and so they can sell butter and wheat to Communist countries for less than American citizens have to pay. But when it comes to using my money to subsidize the enemies of our country to make them more difficult to defeat, I simply must protest. Let's not be crass enough to blame this on God, turning the other cheek, brotherly love, all that jazz. God gave us minds, but he left it to us to decide how to use them. Someone has their thinking button switched off.

Anyway, how can we supply anyone anywhere with \$1 billion worth of anything when we are going in debt much more than that already for just 1 year? This is beyond my comprehension. Suppose there was a very needy family in my neighborhood. Also suppose, too, that we were in debt for our next 3 years' income. How could I go to that family and say, "Please take our income for the next month, we have so much." Even if I could, would they appreciate it? Would it accomplish miracles for them?

Please tell me this situation isn't so. I would be glad to hear I am wrong.

Another thing, recently I was displeased to read disparaging remarks concerning Congressmen who have the gall to vote on legislation according to their conscience or what they believe is the right thing. At the same time much praise is abounding for the President who is not above using means that are not cricket to get his way. Is this democracy? If Congressmen are not going to hold their own, it will be the same as not having a Congress.

Poor Thomas Jefferson and Ben Franklin. I hope they can't see what's going on today. If they can, I hope they have some means to straighten things out.

Most sincerely,

Mr. Kermit Gordon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the following article from the recent edition of the Berkshire Eagle comments on a man whom I know we have all come to respect. I am speaking of Mr. Kermit Gordon, who recently left the post of

Director of the Bureau of the Budget. The article highlights the many accomplishments of this outstanding man who was once professor of economics at Williams College in the First Congressional District of Massachusetts. It also expresses the hope that we have not seen the last of Mr. Gordon in public life. I concur in this sentiment, as I am sure many of you do. May I commend the full text of this article by Mr. Edward J. Michelson to the attention of my colleagues.

BROOKINGS POST FOR KERMIT GORDON TO PUT HIM IN INFLUENTIAL SPOT

(By Edward J. Michelson)

WASHINGTON.—It is taken for granted that Kermit Gordon will be tapped for occasional assignments by President Johnson after leaving Government in June to become vice president of the influential Brookings Institution. The intention of the one-time Williams College economics professor to resign has been known for some time by correspondents closely following the Executive Offices building, which houses the Budget Bureau, the Council of Economic Advisers, in which Gordon first served in 1961, and the vice president's downtown office, among other units.

The Washington Post comments, "The only consolation in Gordon's departure is that he will remain in Washington * * * a moment's ride from the White House." This is the widespread view here of Gordon's standing in the administration. He is known to have been equally at home on the banks of the Pedernales as the sands of Hyannis.

The Brookings Institution is an independent, nonprofit, and nonpartisan research organization in the social sciences founded by Robert S. Brookings, a St. Louis businessman. Brookings retired at the age of 45 in 1897 to devote himself to philanthropy.

The present organization was chartered in 1927 in Washington under its present name comprising the Institute of Economics (founded in 1920), the Institute of Government Research (founded in 1916), and a research-training division (opened in 1924 as a graduate school of economics and government). It operates on an annual budget of close to \$4 million, having a resident staff of about 150, supplemented by many others in the universities working on Brookings projects. Support comes from philanthropic foundations, endowment, and gifts from private individuals and corporate foundations. Government grants and contracts account for about one-fifth of the operating budget. Work for the Government is done on request, with the proviso that the institution will be free to publish its findings without restriction, as in all other of the Brookings research projects.

Current head of Brookings is Robert D. Calkins, who has been its president and executive head since 1952 and who is given credit for expanding and beefing up a quiescent research institution into one of the most respected private research agencies operating in Washington. Prior to coming to Brookings, Dr. Calkins was dean of Columbia University's Graduate School of Business. Since Dr. Calkins is now 62 and nearing retirement age, it is the supposition around Washington that Gordon, who is not yet 49 and who knows his way around the foundation offices, will be a candidate to head the organization.

In commenting a year ago on what criteria Brookings uses in deciding what research it will undertake Calkins said:

"Our criteria are fairly simple: the problem shall be an important public problem; it shall be researchable; the problem should be an economic, governmental, or foreign policy problem that is related to our current

way program of patient care, medical training, and research during the 11 years since its inception. The mayor publicly acclaimed the Long Island Jewish Hospital for having been deemed worthy of accepting the responsibility for the management of over 1,300 beds at the Queens General Hospital Center.

Mr. Liebowitz outlined the new health facilities which will be available to the 3 million Long Island residents. An open heart surgical suite, expanded service for premature babies, a psychiatric in-patient service and an enlarged intensive care program for treatment of the critically ill were but a few of those mentioned.

Nassau County Executive Eugene H. Nickerson commented that, while the hospital spans the Queens and Nassau County line and most of the 22-acre tract is in Queens, he has always proudly claimed the Long Island Jewish Hospital as a Nassau Hospital. He also stated that almost half of all those who come to the various clinics for out-patient treatment are Nassau County residents.

Mr. Irving Mitchel Felt, president of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York, told the assembled guests that the Long Island Jewish Hospital's building program is part of the federation's \$180 million City of Life Building Fund program.

Dr. Peter Rogatz, executive director of the Long Island Jewish Hospital, cited the hospital's achievements during the past decade: a comprehensive program which includes 48 different clinics, a division of nuclear medicine, the only adolescent clinic and the only premature nursery center on Long Island. Dr. Rogatz concluded his message with the promise to incorporate the best ideals of medicine and the best goals of our democratic society into every aspect and every program of the Long Island Jewish Hospital.

All those attending this memorable groundbreaking ceremony were privileged to hear Mr. Richard Tucker of the Metropolitan Opera Company sing an inspiring rendition of our National Anthem, accompanied by the U.S. Merchant Marine Academy Band.

The need and demand for more and better health services are at an all-time high in this country. Our population is growing and our lifespan increasing. We in government must do all we can to encourage those in the medical profession to continue their research, ever mindful that each new advance will benefit us all, regardless of where we live. Incorporated in the expansion plans of the Long Island Jewish Hospital are the Samuel and Lena Schwartz Research Center and the Evelyn and Saul L. Epstein Teaching Center, vital cores from which we can anticipate improvement in the health standards of our Nation.

LIJH has come a long way since a group of farsighted community leaders met to discuss the creation of a hospital that would answer the health needs of the rapidly growing suburban area. The need: An institution with a superior blending of comprehensive patient care, high quality teaching, and imaginative

research. The Long Island Jewish Hospital has met this need.

On reaching its present eminence, unique for a voluntary hospital of its size, LIJH stops a moment—not to rest—but to reflect upon the accomplishments of the past and to lay even broader plans for the future.

More than most institutions, the Long Island Jewish Hospital, from the beginning, has believed in its own future and has followed its own course. It was a courageous beginning, made possible through the help of the trustees and staff members who dedicated their effort, skill, and vision to founding a hospital with emphasis on excellence. Only the best would do.

So the Long Island Jewish Hospital charts its course today. The excellent patient care, the range of research investigation, and the teaching of young doctors and doctors-to-be all serve to carry out the broad concepts of the founding fathers. Patients represent all races, creeds, and colors—no one is turned away.

Above all, the Long Island Jewish Hospital looks to the future; it moves ahead, wants to accomplish greater things in its service to mankind. The LIJH, with the support of an enlightened and generous community, looks forward with confidence to the next decade, and the decades that follow.

Polish Constitution Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, 22 years ago the world witnessed one of the greatest displays of raw courage ever seen anywhere.

For 42 days the heroic Jewish residents of the Warsaw ghetto held off the massed might of Nazi Germany. In many cases fighting with their bare hands the Jews withstood every attack the Nazis could make until finally the last gallant outposts were overwhelmed by flamethrowers and saturation bombardment.

Probably never in history has the world been given a better opportunity to witness the indomitable spirit of the Jewish people that has enabled them to survive every kind of persecution.

It is to be remembered that a handful of Jews who managed to escape from the sealed-off ghetto through the Warsaw sewer system and ultimately joined the underground who were then fighting to throw off the Nazi yoke. Of these, a few lived to become part of the movement which established the long awaited national Jewish state in Israel.

On Thursday, April 29, 1965, the American Zionist Organization and 30 other national and metropolitan Jewish organizations held commemorative exercises

in New York City. It is fitting that they held these services to remind us of the heroism of the gallant Jews who for 42 days held off the greatest military machine ever assembled in the history of mankind by one nation.

We must always keep this event fresh in our memory, lest we forget.

For a Marine in Vietnam, Unity on the Home Front

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I would that all might pay heed to the patriotic words that a mother of a U.S. Marine serving in Vietnam would have us hear. While her message was directed to Ben Maidenberg, executive editor of the Akron Beacon Journal, I am certain that we can all benefit by taking the content of her letter to our hearts and minds.

Our President has set a course of action in the Far East. The great majority, myself included, are in full support of that operation and believe that it should only be concluded when successful. There can be no partisanship when the enemy challenges.

This distinguished mother, Mrs. Leonard Powell, of Barberton, Ohio, has brought forth a document that might well be the creed for all Americans. They rank well alongside the quotation that she gives from our late great President, Abraham Lincoln.

As one who has a son serving in the Armed Forces in the Far East, I can understand the feeling of Mrs. Powell. I can but echo her wonderful words. I, too, hope that my son, and all other sons, do not feel that we are not united in support of their activities.

Since Mrs. Powell wrote her letter, a new front has opened. Here, close to our shores, Communist influences would create a new nation under their domination. Again I unite with our President in his actions.

I can but agree with Mrs. Powell that the world could misunderstand any disunity in our ranks.

I am afraid, however, that there are those who would foster such a misunderstanding. Let us by our actions here, refute them.

The United States of America is a nation that always has shown great concern for the lives of our people. We abhor war but we love freedom. We must and shall maintain this freedom.

Mrs. Powell's letter, as published in the Akron Beacon Journal, follows:

FOR A MARINE IN VIETNAM, UNITY ON THE HOME FRONT

To the Editor:

As the mother of a very young marine stationed 35 miles from the North Vietnam border, I am very much concerned with the

A2134

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

criticism of and demonstrations against the use of our American military in the southeast Asia conflict.

These can surely cause our enemies to draw the wrong conclusions and keep them from negotiating peace.

As much as I would like to have my son home, I am sure he knows why he is there.

He knows, as did the founders of our great country, that God lives.

He knows that communism depends largely upon substituting the state for God.

He knows there is a threat to his political and individual freedoms.

He knows that as precious as life, is his heritage of these freedoms.

He knows communism cannot live in just one country.

He knows that if he has to fight, he is fighting for democracy. He knows the enemy is fighting to make the world safe for communism.

He knows that throughout the ages, men have died for freedom.

"This love of liberty which God has planted in us," Abraham Lincoln said, "constitutes the bulwark of our liberty and independence. It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling sea coasts, our Army and our Navy.

"Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere. Destroy this spirit, and we have planted the seeds of despotism at our very doors."

I only hope my son does not know we are not united on the home front.

Mrs. LEONARD POWELL.

A Resolution Concerning Establishment of a National Lakeshore Park in Porter County, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the necessity for the creation of a national lakeshore park along the southern shores of Lake Michigan in Porter County has been before the Congress for some time.

The swimming, bathing, and recreational facilities on the southern shores of Lake Michigan, especially in the area known as the Indiana Dunes, has been enjoyed and used as a recreational center for generations. Gradually industry will usurp the total area of the beautiful sand dunes and perfect natural shores of Lake Michigan in this area unless the Federal Government takes steps toward the establishment of a natural lakeshore park.

I am submitting a resolution passed by the Common Council of the City of Hammond, Ind., at a recent meeting:

RESOLUTION 3453R

A resolution concerning establishment of a national lakeshore park in Porter County, Ind.

That whereas it has been brought to our attention that certain bills, identified as S. 360, H.R. 51, H.R. 3833, and similar measures are pending in the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States and that their purpose is to appropriate certain lands for the establishment of a na-

tional lakeshore park along the shores of Lake Michigan in Porter County, Ind.; and

Whereas there is a great need for a national park and recreation center in the State of Indiana, and more particularly in the Dunes areas in the northern part thereof: Now, therefore be it

Resolved by the Common Council of the City of Hammond, Ind., That we are in favor of the above identified bills for the purpose of establishing a National Lakeshore Park along the shores of Lake Michigan, Ind., and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to our U.S. Senators and Congressmen as well as our State officials with the request that they make every effort to provide the cities of Indiana with this much needed facility.

GEORGE W. CARLSON,
President.

What Is Wrong With America?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, most Members of Congress share an increasing concern over a few misguided youths of today. We know also how most young Americans feel about the small group of beatniks that stain the image of their age group. It is a national tragedy, I feel, that the energy and creative talents of these young iconoclasts are being wasted.

Mr. Bill Casteel, in the April 29 Athens, Tenn., Post-Athenian, has written a timely and provocative editorial on this subject, and under unanimous consent, I include it in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WHAT IS WRONG IN AMERICA?

(By Bill Casteel)

What's happening to this country of ours—this country made great by a mutual respect for law and order—this country made great by stern discipline by our educators—this country made great by an unbending love and devotion to that flag called Old Glory?

Almost daily there is a riot on the campus of some college or university. Students cloaking themselves behind various freedom of expression and freedom of speech movements take command of institutions and actually gain support from faculty members.

Beatnik-type beards are allowed to flourish on the faces of young college men in colleges where it was once considered taboo to grow as much as a moustache.

What has happened that makes so many young people feel they have to do this or that for this or that cause?

Granted, there are many inequities in the American system. In the field of race relations there is much to be done on the parts of both races. Perhaps some of the laws established by colleges and universities are a bit strict for the 20th century liberal. And maybe the United States is wrong by having men and ammunition in the Vietnam war.

Still, none of these inequities should provide the beatniks with licenses to destroy and ruin college buildings. None of these inequities should be sufficient to allow a college campus to be turned into a beginners school for Greenwich Village. That kind of abstract living is all right but the taxpayer should not have to finance it.

And if the beatniks who patrol the White House in protest of our actions in Vietnam don't like the way we're handling the situation then perhaps a visa or two could be provided. I personally don't love this idea of Uncle Sam taking a chunk out of my paycheck for income taxes but I haven't been moved to march on the IRS.

The sense of values of the Nation is changing. Once it was considered all-American and noteworthy if a man worked hard and provided a good home for his family. Once it was of primary importance to get as much education (in the classroom) as possible.

Today the picture is different. It's far more popular (and newsworthy we might add) for a man to walk off his job, let his family go hungry and march off to Washington to protest our men in Vietnam or fluoride in the water in Timbuktu. And the student is better rounded if he plays hooky to grow a dirty-looking beard, screams "down with college regulations" and speaks out for a cause.

Gee, I wish I could grow a beard. Think of the soap one could save. And if some questionable "cause" did come up, I could join in without having to show my face.

I asked what is happening. I don't know. And I'm afraid to really find out.

A National Cemetery at Fort Custer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the Michigan Legislature has adopted a resolution recommending that the Congress establish a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich. I agree wholeheartedly with this resolution and have introduced a bill, H.R. 6998, which would accomplish this purpose.

It would indeed be fitting and proper that a portion of the historic land at Fort Custer be dedicated as a national cemetery by the U.S. Government in honor of its veterans who would choose to be buried there and, under unanimous consent I include this proposal in the RECORD:

HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 12

A concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress relative to the establishing of a National Cemetery at Fort Custer

(Offered by Representatives DeMaso, Mrs. McCollough, Cyril H. Root, Spencer, Erlandsen, O'Brien, Jacobetti, Wagner, Arnett, Esch, and Little.)

Whereas through the recent action of the national Defense Department, many areas at Fort Custer are being deactivated and the various parts of the fort are being disengaged for other activities; and

Whereas there is a great need in the State of Michigan for a national cemetery for the veterans of the State of Michigan and surrounding territories; and

Whereas it would be fitting and proper that a portion of the land at Fort Custer, which was the scene of training for so many thousands of American soldiers, be dedicated as a national cemetery by the U.S. Government in honor of its veterans: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That the Congress is hereby respectfully urged to create a na-

May 4, 1965

A2153

modern artillerymen from Fort Sill, Okla.

For both events, the commission has prepared special cachets, and covers will be dispatched from Fort Washita and from Fort Towson. Those wishing to have covers cacheted may send the same to the Oklahoma Civil War Centennial Commission, 1108 Colcord Building, Oklahoma City. Covers should be clearly marked for either "Fort Washita" or for "Fort Towson."

Mr. Speaker, I extend to all Members an invitation to come to Oklahoma and take part in these festivities marking the end of the Civil War.

Firmness in Vietnam Is the Only Right Course

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, firmness with flexibility to negotiate, if the opportunity presents itself, as proposed by President Johnson, appears to be the proper and sound policy to pursue in the Vietnam crisis.

In amplification on this policy and position, under unanimous consent, I place my remarks contained in my recent newsletter—Capitol Comments—in the Appendix of the RECORD.

This newsletter, dated May 3, entitled "Firmness in Vietnam Is the Only Right Course" follows:

[From Capitol Comments]

FIRMNESS IN VIETNAM IS THE ONLY RIGHT COURSE

(By JOE L. EVINS, Member of Congress, Fourth District, Tennessee)

Our country's stand in Vietnam is uppermost in the thoughts of Congress, as it is in every American home.

Nine months have elapsed since Congress, by concurrent resolution, voiced virtually unanimous bipartisan support of our Government's firm policy against Communist aggression in southeast Asia. Not a single Member of the House and only two Members of the Senate voted against this resolution.

Declaring that the peace and security of southeast Asia are vital to our country's national security interests, the resolution called for "all necessary measures to repel an attack against the forces of the United States and prevent further aggression."

Congressional support of President Johnson remains overwhelmingly strong because he is carrying out this policy with notable fidelity and resolution, and also because it grows increasingly clear that this is the right policy for the United States.

Our Government has demonstrated in every possible way that the United States is ready to go to the conference table the minute the Communists cease their aggression. At the same time, our country is making it crystal clear that there will be no negotiations as long as aggression continues.

Meanwhile, both military and diplomatic pressures are being vigorously applied to convince the Communists that continued ag-

gression is neither wise nor profitable. These pressures are being used with great skill, and with carefully measured restraint to prevent escalation of the conflict if possible.

This policy of measured response—of "firmness with moderation, readiness for peace with refusal to retreat"—will continue to be pressed with unflagging zeal, President Johnson this week emphasized at his news conference.

There are certainly risks in this course, but the dangers in an alternative policy—the course of appeasement and retreat—are enormously greater.

President Johnson summed up the matter in these words:

"This is the clearest lesson of our time. From Munich until today, we have learned that to yield to aggression brings only greater threats and brings even more destructive war. To stand firm is the only guarantee of lasting peace. * * * Wherever we have stood firm, aggression has been halted, peace has been restored, and liberty has been maintained. This was true under President Truman, under President Eisenhower, under President Kennedy, and it will be true again in southeast Asia."

Yukon River Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH J. RIVERS

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 14, 1965

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, in the Atlantic Monthly for May 1965 there appears an article by Paul Brooks roundly condemning the idea of a dam and hydroelectric project at Rampart Canyon on the Yukon River in Alaska. Incidentally, in an editors note, the Atlantic Monthly joins forces with Paul Brooks by calling the project ill conceived.

This eagerness to prematurely arrive at condemnatory conclusions is reflected in the title of the article: "The Plot To Drown Alaska." I call it premature because the six-man task force, named by Secretary of the Interior Udall to analyze the 1,000-page field-level report prepared after 5 years of studies and investigations by all segments of the Department of the Interior concerned, as well as the Corps of Engineers, has just begun its work. Until the task force completes its work, and the Secretary of the Interior publishes his conclusion, we will not have the overall official determination pertaining to the multiple aspects and relative merits and demerits of this great hydroelectric resource.

Commenting upon this derogatory article is a sane and sensible editorial appearing in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner of April 28, 1965. The text of which is as follows:

THE PLOT TO WHAT * * *

Last summer conservationist-author Paul Brooks took a trip through the Yukon Flats.

"Flocks of mallards congregated near the shore, and somewhere from a slough echoed the cries of red-throated loons," Brooks recalls in an article coming out in the May issue of Atlantic Monthly.

"Though in August we were too late for the nesting season, we saw more and more waterfowl as we approached the flats: Pairs of widgeon, small flocks of white-fronted geese, and two sandhill cranes, long necks outstretched and wings beating slowly as they flew directly overhead."

Emotionally Brooks made a strong case against having a lake and dam there to generate low-cost electricity.

Factually, he slipped up because either the comprehensive Rampart project reports of the Interior Department were not available to him when he wrote the piece, or he didn't pay much attention to them if they were available.

Brooks describes at length two preliminary reports, but Interior's massive 997-page study, conducted under the multiple-use concept, is disposed of in one paragraph.

His article is called "The Plot To Drown Alaska." Considering that Alaska covers 586,400 square miles and the Rampart impoundment would cover 10,000 square miles, the title is a telling clue as to the slant.

The author says alternate waterfowl habitat is "not specified." He should read the fish and wildlife report on impact and measures to mitigate losses.

He spoofs the thought that Rampart could pay for itself. The projections say it would.

The whole concept of economic resource development evolving from the availability of low-cost power is dismissed ("Clearly the importance of mineral deposits in Alaska has been seriously exaggerated") and no mention is made of the existing prohibitive costs.

Brooks gets in a plug for another dam (Devil Canyon), where the cost would be 6.36 mills per kilowatt hour as compared to 2.01 at Rampart, according to the field report. He also mentions "cheap nuclear power" (computed in the report at 5.5 mills for power production alone).

Mention is made of timber destruction, but not of logging the basin.

An abbreviated summation of benefits from the dam overlooks the potentials for flood control and a fresh water fishery.

And so on.

But one must allow an author his subject, and it is when he is discussing what he terms "primitive values" that Brooks is most persuasive. "This is wild country, and its values are wilderness values." Few will challenge this statement, and it is this rather than the projections and figures that gives the underlying weight to Brooks' thesis.

Brooks intimates the conservationist does not like to be regarded as "the enemy of prosperity." Yet neither do those favoring "prosperity" like to be regarded as enemies of wildlife. When the known losses and the known benefits of the project are analyzed, such charges are oversimplified and therefore meaningless.

If Rampart were envisioned merely with the almighty construction dollar in mind, we would agree it should not be built at the expense of wilderness values. But as studies over the recent years have recognized, the case is far greater than that.

Articles for national magazines are usually written and scheduled considerably in advance of publication. The Department of the Interior's comprehensive report, including studies by the Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Alaska Railroad, Geological Survey, was published only a little over 2 months ago.

Since there may not have been time to incorporate these findings in the article about drowning Alaska, we trust the editors of Atlantic Monthly will see fit to bring the case up to date by publishing a sequel.

A2154

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

May 4, 1965

Paul Harris, Founder of Rotary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this poem, written by my constituent, Vernon B. Hampton, is a tribute to Paul Harris, the founder of that unique organization, Rotary International. This is a special tribute paid to Rotary by Mr. Hampton on the 60th anniversary of the founding of the organization.

The poem follows:

PAUL HARRIS—FOUNDER OF ROTARY
(An original poem by Rotarian Vernon B. Hampton)

A salute to Rotary International and a special tribute to its architect in Rotary's 60th year, 1965.

Great movements find the man,
The man the hour
When world events are shaped,
And new paths opened for mankind
In history's onward march.

In 1905 the man and hour met
Unheralded,
Unnoticed in Chicago's busy mart
Where teeming multitudes
Tolled at their daily tasks,
Heedless of others,
Hardly heeding self:
The rush of life left little time for living.
What was the gain where none enjoyed the game?

A lonely man was young Paul Harris there,
Wanting a friend, companionship,
Instructive intercourse,
A chance to serve his fellow men.
Suiting the action to his need,
Four kindred souls at his behest
Began the great adventure.
A circle drawn,
A simple meal, a fruitful talk,
Warmed by one brotherhood.

Idea into action,
That spelled R-o-t-a-r-y.

So struck the hour,
And a new light lit our world.
Down history's corridors
The sounding gong resounded
As Rotary was born,
Simply,
With dignity,
With promise.

The pioneer of service clubs,
Rotary was first to meet a modern need
For a society of men of diverse callings,
Classified by their vocations,
Desired by Rotary for their worth in civic leadership,

Success in business or profession,
Personal attributes and fellowship.
Rotary offered to all, its high ideals
And a program for accomplishment,

And challenged the world at large
To raise its sights,
Reorient its thinking:
To dignify the role of man in every station,
Encourage enterprise,
Promote research, advance the cause of peace.

Leaders of local fame and world acclaim
Became Rotarians,
Proud of an invitation
Into Rotary—Hallmark of leadership.

The emblemized wheel became a passport far
and wide,
Symbol of action,
Mark of accomplishment.

Mottoes are ideals sloganized:

"Who profits most serves best
His craft, community, mankind."
This early concept found its complement
In "Service above self."
The Founder's aim for all Rotarians.
"Live and help live" made living worth the while.

As conscience aroused is energy empowered,
Rotary's collective force
Became a whirlwind of good works
In paths of service.

Paul Harris knew the score:
In many lands he had been seen poverty
and ignorance.

Helping his fellow men became a passion,
Learned in his boyhood home
Where love and faith in God
Fashioned the man-to-be.

The spirit of Vermont possessed his soul:
New England lakes gave him serenity,
Majestic mountains, goals of high resolve,
Meadows bequeathed their beauty, streams
their calm;
Snow-silenced winters, time for contemplation.

Tempered and tried in youth,
He grew to manhood modest, patient, wise,
Enduring as the granite hills of home,
Endowed with zeal to serve, not to be served.
No pretense marked his modest mien,
And friends in converse found his epigrams
and wit

Enjoyable, lighting the moments of companionship
With warmth and wisdom.

As Rotary expanded,
Crossed boundary lines, seas, continents and hemispheres,
Paul's global dream became reality.
Not easily, for there were times of stress:
When inhumanity to man seemed paramount
And war engulfed the world;
When poverty, disaster, selfishness,
Aggressive national ambition,
"Broaden our understanding," he told Rotary,
Still prevailed.

"Strengthen the bond, rebuild, renew.
These gains will come," he said prophetically.

His steady hand from 1905 to 1947,
Helped guide the craft launched on life's
tortured seas.

Never alone,
After the dim days when Rotary began,
Strong men of Rotary upheld his arm,
Against the setting sun,
When weary toil and travel took his strength.
And always by his side, part of the Rotary
van,
Was Bonnie Jean, beloved wife,
His Rotary Ann.

Grateful is Rotary that Paul Harris lived so
long,

To firm the movement in the mold he formed
in faith.

A living monument, Rotary—
No lengthened shadow,
But a tel-star on the world,
Joining the clubs in one,
Communicating.

Progress unparalleled is seen,
In Rotary's 60 years;
Its growth phenomenal,
Its program rich and timed to current needs:
An annual harvest of good works and leadership.

Thousands of times repeated,
The human mind scarce comprehends the
global impact
That Rotary has had on the world's millions
In three score years.
These forces of fraternity
Have breached estranging walls of custom,
time and distance,

In Friendship's name,
And made one world of many.
For Rotary, the Past is prologue, future limitless,
As Paul would have it be.

A few days before his death

Paul wrote a friend:
"I still can appreciate
The press of a warm hand
And the smile of a friendly face."
Nearing eternity
His Godward thoughts still felt the warmth
of friendship.

Essence of Rotary. Beautiful epitaph.

EPILOGUE

Spirit of Paul Harris, invisible,
Brooding benignly
Over the broad expanse
Of Rotary International.
Watching the child of his dreams—
His creature,
His image,
His masterpiece.

Our Future Water Supply

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ED REINECKE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 4, 1965

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, the availability of adequate water supplies has long been a major concern in southern California and remains so today. The phenomenal population growth in the entire Pacific Southwest has resulted in steadily increasing demands on the water of the Colorado River—the veritable lifeline of the Basin States—and the trend continues unabated. It is estimated, for instance, that the population in southern California alone will be 16.6 million by 1980, about a 65-percent increase over today's count. So, the obvious need now, as we look toward the future, is to seek water supplies from other sources. The Los Angeles Herald-Examiner, a great Hearst newspaper with the largest afternoon circulation in the country, treats that subject intelligently and objectively in an editorial, published April 13, 1965. I am therefore pleased to insert in the RECORD that editorial, and a related letter to the editor, which appeared in the same newspaper on April 20, 1965:

[From the Los Angeles (Calif.) Herald-Examiner, Apr. 13, 1965]

OUR FUTURE WATER SUPPLY

Things are looking forward in the plans of the Pacific Southwest to obtain future water supplies from the Pacific Northwest's Columbia and other rivers for the semiarid portions of the Western States of this area.

Almost all of the water authorities, chambers of commerce and other civic organizations in California, Arizona and other water-thirsty States are in solid agreement on the proposed compromise on water between California and Arizona.

Bills now in Congress would authorize the long-controversial central Arizona water project, with assurances to California of 4.4 million acre-feet of Colorado River water annually, until completion of works to import an additional 2.5 million acre-feet annually into the Lower Colorado River from outside sources.

The outside sources of course is the real rub in the matter. Outside sources means only one thing, that water must be imported and transported by canals from such points as the Columbia River, the Snake River in Idaho or possibly even from both points.

mutilation and destruction and improving the rural economy.

A beautiful landscape has universal appeal and is becoming all too scarce. The rural countryside beckons the tow-weary Americans seeking restful surroundings. What the countryside provides is the responsibility of all of the people. The ugly signs of rural poverty still are around us. Impoverished farm and ranch lands still deprive the Nation of a greater beauty and a greater prosperity which can be had.

Nebraskans, through their efforts to conserve and develop the soil and water resources of the State, have restored much natural beauty to the landscape and have assured the lasting beauty of many acres. But we must continue our efforts and make our State and Nation still more beautiful and more prosperous. And only the determination of the people can make it so.

United States Has No Easy Choice in Vietnam Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1965

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I commend to President Johnson's critics the following editorial from the April 28, 1965, edition of the Sacramento, Calif., Bee which sets forth very clearly what the Johnson administration is attempting to accomplish in Vietnam. Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following editorial:

[From the Sacramento Bee, Apr. 28, 1965]
UNITED STATES HAS NO EASY CHOICE IN VIETNAM DILEMMA

Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., historian and former Kennedy-Johnson presidential aid, made clear during a Sacramento talk that American policy in Vietnam must find a middle course between withdrawal from the area and escalation of the battle into a full-scale war.

Speaking before a community forum sponsored by the Bee, KFBK, and KOVR-TV, Schlesinger said President Lyndon B. Johnson is pursuing a middle course aimed at getting Hanoi to negotiate.

This is the only sensible goal. The dilemma arises not from arguments about the logic of the goal of eventual negotiation but rather from the frustrating fact there is no road to the accepted goal which seems to assure success.

Schlesinger stated Hanoi has made it plain that at this time there appears to be no chance it will accept Johnson's offer to negotiate because "they think they are going to win the war anyway." Therefore, Schlesinger said, we will have to convince them otherwise.

This is the heart of the problem. How do we convince them? Schlesinger questions the effectiveness of air power, contending World War II demonstrated the use of air power actually increases a people's will to resist. And aircraft have not proven particularly effective in guerrilla warfare.

Nevertheless Schlesinger said full commitment would be a mistake, because it would require use of ground forces on a far larger

scale than did Korea, in less favorable terrain and with more vulnerable supply lines.

The present bombings in the north are valid as a tactic only to the extent they lead to the goal of negotiations.

The problem in Vietnam has no easy answer. Withdrawal and abandonment of commitments are out of the question. It would be equally wrong in a moment of frustration to start bombing population centers in the north or to become committed to a land war in Asia.

The only hope is that America's restraint, combined with a demonstration that it will not withdraw under pressure, will induce the North Vietnamese to consider negotiations. All avenues should be used to make clear the desire to find a peaceful solution. The decision after that is up to Hanoi.

Some Civil Rights Leaders Not Interested in Helping Negroes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 13, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, it has been apparent for some months that many of the leaders of the so-called civil rights movement are more interested in controversy than in solution. There are those whose principal purpose seems to be in continued strife, in increasing tensions between the races, and in fostering hatred of the white man in the hearts of Negroes.

There is no secret that this has been the goal of the Communists from the inception of the Communist conspiracy to dominate the world and to destroy the United States. Every Communist blueprint has outlined a program for encouraging racial unrest in the United States with the hope that an eventual Negro revolution would cause the collapse of this country. There is no mystery, then, why so many of the leaders of the current demonstrations in the South, here in Washington and on many of our college campuses are known Communists or those who have a close affinity to Communist organizations.

The following column by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak which appeared in the Washington Post, clearly indicates how some of the leaders of the demonstrations encourage hate, violence, and lawlessness:

INSIDE REPORT: THE TWO FACES OF CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

DEMOPOLIS, ALA.—Although the newspaper headlines from here last week told of clashes between Negro demonstrators and tear-gas-tossing police, the more important struggle in Demopolis was waged between moderates and radicals inside the civil rights movement.

In this Black Belt city of 8,500 (where whites outnumber Negroes by less than 50 persons) the two faces of civil rights glare at each other with increasing hostility, as elsewhere in the Deep South.

One face in conciliatory, seeking to reach an accommodation with the white power structure. The other face is revolutionary,

skeptical that "Mr. Charlie" (the white man) will concede anything.

This conflict has ironic overtones in Demopolis. Mayor Ed Bailey, a segregationist who realizes a new day has come to the South, has made more concessions than any other mayor in rural Alabama. Yet the civil rights radicals—not the moderates—control events here and have turned Demopolis into the South's current trouble spot.

Doubly ironic is the fact there is only one civil rights organization active here—the Reverend Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC). But the SCLC itself is split between radicals and moderates, its own fieldmen here traveling separate paths.

This was graphically illustrated at a civil rights mass meeting one recent Sunday in the Morning Star Baptist Church.

Directing the meeting was the Reverend Samuel Wells, of Albany, Ga., a stout, worried-looking SCLC organizer. Under his supervision, young middle-class Demopolis Negroes, dressed in their Sunday best, softly revealed results of negotiations they and Wells had conducted with Mayor Bailey.

The results were impressive. Indeed, SCLC has won more in Demopolis during 6 days than in Selma (45 miles to the west) during 6 weeks. Bailey had agreed to multiple demands by the Demopolis Civil Club (an SCLC-sponsored group organized by Mr. Wells) aimed mainly at better jobs for Negroes.

But as the civil club officers recounted their negotiations, a dozen young men and women (both white and Negro) seated on the church altar seethed in anger.

Dressed in disheveled work and sport clothes, these were the fieldworkers of SCLC's militant youth branch. Supposedly, they got orders not from Mr. Wells in Demopolis, but from the Reverend James Bevel—most militant of Dr. King's lieutenants—by telephone from Selma.

Mr. Bevel's field commander in Demopolis, a northern Negro named Gerald Turley, moved to the pulpit. Dressed in sweaty T-shirt and blue jeans, Turley stirred the crowd for the first time with his gravel-voiced eloquence.

Though Mr. Wells and the Voters League wanted a halt to demonstrations, Turley shouted, "We're going to be on the streets. We're going to die in the street if need be."

Henry Wershaw, a young white SCLC worker from New York, was even more explosive. "If the white man won't let you have your freedom, you're going to have to take it," he yelled.

The upshot came the next morning. In negotiations at city hall, Bailey agreed to much more than Selma's officials have gotten—city government supervisory positions for Negroes and guaranteed sales jobs in Demopolis stores. Nevertheless, Turley sent Demopolis teenagers (kept out of school against the wishes of the Civil Club) marching through the streets.

Bailey would have issued a parade permit, but Turley refused to ask for it. To maintain the principle of law and order, Bailey told police to stop the marchers. The result: Tear gas and national publicity.

Indeed, national publicity—not jobs in Demopolis stores—was what Turley was seeking. Believing that the white man is unworthy of trust, the civil rights movement's revolutionary wing believes in agitation, agitation, and still more agitation to bring out the worst in the white man. Such is the rationale of the Gerald Turleys.

But Gerald Turley will leave Demopolis sometime soon. When he does, the Demopolis Negroes will be left to reach permanent understanding with the white establishment. That's why many of them feel today that Turley's radical tactics, coming after—not before—the whites had been forced to the bargaining table, have done more harm than good.

May 4, 1965

Anniversary of Adoption of Polish
ConstitutionSPEECH
OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to join my colleagues in paying tribute to the great nation of Poland on the 174th anniversary of the adoption of the Polish Constitution of May 3, 1791.

This anniversary is particularly meaningful to me because my parents of blessed memory came to this country from Poland, my mother, in the year 1871 at the age of 2, and my father in the year 1883 at the age of 14.

The United States of America was indeed a land of opportunity and promise to my parents. They were married here on Thanksgiving Day 1890 and were blessed with seven children. They celebrated their 61st wedding anniversary in 1951 and when my father passed away in 1952 and my mother in 1953 they were survived by 7 children, all married, 15 grandchildren, and 26 great grandchildren. Their descendants have made and are making a contribution to our American way of life. They served in our Armed Forces. Each in his own way and each in his own community is active in business the professions and in community and philanthropic affairs. And now, Mr. Speaker, one of their sons is privileged to sit in this House, the most distinguished legislative body in the world. Such is the way of life in our Nation.

The Congress of the United States remembers Polish Constitution Day and salutes the many Americans who are proud of their Polish heritage and recalls the document outlining the principles of democracy which was adopted by a nation which in 1791 had experienced more than a century of cruelty and repression.

The courageous people of Poland are again experiencing a period of oppression and cruelty under a Communist government not of their own choosing. The people of Poland will continue their fight for freedom and liberty and one day, we pray that will be real soon, they will once again regain the precious rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—the rights they won in 1791, in a bloodless revolution.

A land which gave birth to such great artists as Chopin and Paderewski, who are speaking to peoples throughout the world in the international language of music, is a land which should be a free land, a land of liberty.

The Congress will this year consider an Immigration bill of great importance to people in many lands throughout the world, who seek admission to this land of promise and opportunity. Let us also this year join with the people of Poland in their desire to find a new life within their own country by gaining freedom from the oppression of communism and once again make Poland a land of liberty.

Good News From Secretary of the
Treasury Fowler

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 27, 1965

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, in a statement at a meeting of the Cabinet last month, Secretary of the Treasury Henry H. Fowler cited improvement of the international monetary system as the major task for the Treasury and the financial authorities of the rest of the free world in the next few years.

Secretary Fowler's intention to give major emphasis to this effort is good news indeed because a sound international monetary system is indispensable to continued economic growth and prosperity throughout the free world.

Because of their importance, I include the full text of Secretary Fowler's remarks:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE HENRY H. FOWLER, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, AT A MEETING OF THE CABINET, THE WHITE HOUSE, APRIL 8, 1965

Day by day, it is becoming increasingly clear that our national security and our capacity for effective diplomatic action throughout the world are directly related to the strength of our currency. A strong currency is an essential underpinning for our worldwide responsibilities.

We are, therefore, determined to keep the dollar strong by balancing our international accounts. Our balance-of-payments program is proving very successful—and I am fully confident that the measures adopted will continue to do the job as long as we need them.

We have been gratified with the response of the American financial and business community, and we have achieved a favorable impression abroad. But we must remember that our position depends upon our ability to sell enough of our products in competitive world markets to cover both our imports and our other public and private outpayments. We must continue to screen carefully dollar expenditures abroad on government account. If we can attract foreign capital and foreign tourists, this will help. In addition, with our European friends, we will need to develop the lasting answers to the marked differences between our own large supplies of capital for investment and the deficiencies that appear in Europe and exert their attraction on American funds.

The success of our program, along with the promise of the improvement offered the British position by measures announced in the budget last Tuesday will, in growing degree, provide grounds for increasingly fruitful discussions of the international payments system.

Our determination to keep the dollar strong is an essential prerequisite to the successful negotiation of sound improvements in the international monetary system to adopt it to the changing requirements of an expanding free world economy. We have not been standing still amidst changing conditions. Discussions have been taking place among international experts seeking, for example, to evaluate various possibilities of supplementing the means of international payments when supplies of dollars abroad prove thin. And these studies are in any

case an essential forerunner of any agreement on the path that ought to be taken.

Like Secretary Dillon before me, I think the greatest challenge in this area is to work out a steadily improving international monetary system, so as to facilitate a continuing expansion of trade and economic development in the free world. That, I believe, is the major task facing our Treasury and the financial authorities of the rest of the free world in the next few years. I approach this task with an open mind and a willingness to study all practical proposals.

Pie Dufour Cites Navy's Civil War Study

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 3, 1965

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Charles L. "Pie" Dufour of New Orleans is a Renaissance man of the fourth estate.

Pie's interests are catholic, and he reflects this fact in his column in the New Orleans States-Item and the Times-Picayune. The field of history, nevertheless, is probably Pie's favorite. And in this field, he is a figure of stature in his own right: author of several historical books, lecturer, educator, and past president of the Louisiana Historical Association.

In his column of April 4, Pie commented on the completion by the Navy Department of the five-part "Civil War Naval Chronology." Pie called the chronology "one of the notable permanent contributions to come out of the Civil War Centennial."

In view of this heady praise, I feel sure that my colleagues will be interested in this completed work by the Department of the Navy. It is therefore a pleasure to include Pie's column in the Record herewith:

[From the Times-Picayune, Apr. 4, 1965]

CIVIL WAR PROJECT COMPLETED BY NAVY
(by Pie Dufour)

A couple of weeks ago, I told you about the launching of a monumental historical project by the Navy Department with the publication of the first of 15 projected volumes on the "Naval Documents of the American Revolution."

Today I want to tell you about the completion by the Navy Department of one of the most important contributions to the literature of the Civil War; namely the five-part "Civil War Naval Chronology."

The Naval History Division of the Navy Department undertook, as its participation in the observance of the Civil War Centennial, now drawing to a close, to publish each year a chronology on the Civil War at sea a century ago.

The project, started on a modest basis in 1961, immediately became a major one, and now, with the issuance of part V, covering naval events of 1865, the work is completed. It includes a total of 627 pages of text and pictures, with a day-by-day story of the naval events of 1861-65.

Invaluable as a reference work, delightful just to browse in, and full of fine pictures and reproductions of significant documents,

May 4, 1965

a sample of such an agreement required by a large corporation. (See enclosure.)

I hereby assign to the corporation my entire right, title, and interest in any invention or idea, patentable or not, hereafter made or conceived solely or jointly by me:

(a) While working in the corporation in an executive, managerial, planning, technical, research or engineering capacity (including development, manufacturing, systems, applied science, sales and customer engineering); and

(b) Which relates in any manner to the actual or anticipated business of the corporation or its subsidiaries, or relates to its actual or anticipated research and development, or is suggested by or results from any task assigned to me or work performed by me for or on behalf of the corporation.

I am a physicist for this corporation and have a personal interest in patent policy, but I also believe that it goes far beyond me. There are thousands of essentially and technically trained people who would bring their ideas to fruition if only they could be assured of reaping the fruits of the labor.

I cannot conceive of any man with a sense of justice not finding this patent agreement at variance with Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

EMPLOYEE CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION AND INVENTION AGREEMENT

(To be signed by all employees on the first day of employment.)

In consideration of my employment by

1. I will not disclose to anyone, outside of — or use in other than — business, any confidential information or material relating to the business of — or its subsidiaries, either during or after my employment, except with — written permission.

2. I will not disclose to —, or induce — to use, any confidential information or material belonging to others.

3. I will comply, and do all things necessary for — to comply, with U.S. Government regulations, and with provisions of contracts between the agencies of the U.S. Government or their contractors and —, which relate either to patent rights or to the safeguarding of information pertaining to the defense of the United States.

4. I hereby assign to — my entire right, title and interest in any invention or idea, patentable or not, hereafter made or conceived solely or jointly by me:

(a) while working in — in an executive, managerial, planning, technical, research or engineering capacity (including development, manufacturing, systems, applied science, sales and customer engineering); and

(b) which relates in any manner to the actual or anticipated business of — or its subsidiaries, or relates to its actual or anticipated research and development, or is suggested by or results from any task assigned to me or work performed by me for or on behalf of —;

except any invention or idea which I cannot assign to — because of a prior invention agreement with — which is effective until — (Give name and date or write "none").

5. I agree that in connection with any invention or idea covered by paragraph 4:

(a) I will disclose it promptly to the local — patent operations manager; and

(b) I will, on his request, promptly execute a specific assignment of title to — and do anything else reasonably necessary to enable — to secure a patent therefor in the United States and in foreign countries.

6. I represent that I have indicated on the back of this form whether or not I have any inventions or ideas, not covered by paragraph 4, in which I have any right, title, or interest, and which were previously conceived either wholly or in part by me, but

neither published nor filed in the U.S. Patent Office, and identified all of these.

(It is in your interest to establish that any such invention or idea was made before employment by —. You should not disclose such inventions or ideas in detail, but only identify them by the title and date of documents describing them. If you wish to interest — in such inventions and ideas, you may submit them to — in accordance with the provisions contained in —.)

7. I acknowledge receipt of a copy of this agreement, and agree that, with respect to the subject matter hereof, it is my entire agreement with —, superseding any previous, oral or written communications, representations, understandings, or agreements with — or any official or representative thereof.

Witness
(Employee's manager or other appropriate representative)

Signed — (Employee's full name)

Date —
The following are inventions or ideas, not covered by paragraph 4, in which I have any right, title, or interest, and which were previously conceived either wholly or in part by me, but neither published nor filed in the U.S. Patent Office (Indicate below or write "none")

Description of documents (if applicable):

Title on document.

Date on document.

Name of witness on document.

Signed — (Employee's full name)

Date —

By —
Tennessee Valley Authority,
Knoxville, Tenn., February 4, 1965.

Hon. Russell B. Long,
U. S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LONG: When the enclosed letter came to me a few days ago, my thoughts went back to the day, nearly 3 years ago, when I appeared before your committee in the hearings on Government patent policy.

You will recall we discussed the fact that new processes developed by TVA in its fertilizer research are patented by TVA; that these patents are made available to the fertilizer industry on a royalty free, nonexclusive basis; and that as a result of this policy, farmers are getting more and better chemical fertilizers and at lower prices than they did 10 or 12 years ago.

We also discussed the special importance of TVA's research and its patent policy to the smaller concerns manufacturing fertilizer. At the time of the hearing 170 of the 207 companies licensed to use TVA patents were in the category of small businesses, and I pointed out our belief that many of those small manufacturers would not have been able to stay in business without the benefits of TVA's research and the use of our patents.

The enclosed letter from the Onachita Fertilizer & Grain Co. is such an illuminating testimonial to many of the points we discussed in your hearing that I feel sure you will be interested to see it. Incidentally, the polyphosphates referred to represent a promising family of fertilizers, new since our discussion, so I can assure you that our work in this field is continuing to show results.

Sincerely yours,
AUBREY J. WAGNER,
Chairman.

ONACHITA FERTILIZER & GRAIN CO., INC.,
Monroe, La., January 25, 1965.

Mr. A. J. WAGNER,
Chairman, Board of Directors, Tennessee Valley Authority, Knoxville, Tenn.

DEAR MR. WAGNER: The recent trend in the fertilizer industry continues, and it appears that small independent manufacturers such as our own firm will be at an even greater

disadvantage in the future. We are calling this to your attention in order to emphasize the importance of TVA's continuing its co-operation with these small independents and the farmers we serve.

In the present situation, a number of major companies will approach an independent to see if he wants to sell his business. If the independent prefers to remain as he is, the major companies seem less interested than before in supplying him, with fringe benefits included. Privately, they confirm that they are working toward captive distribution, and once they attain their objective, the unpredictable requirements of the independent will not be important to them. Those major companies who preferred to supply independents have been forced to abandon this position. So one of our concerns is supply. Phosphate is the material we worry about, polyphosphates in particular.

Perhaps you are aware that when we first thought of using wet-process acid for our liquid mixtures, the only encouraging reports we saw were printed in various trade journals describing TVA's work with superphosphoric acid. We came to your plant and laboratories at Wilson Dam, and observed the research and development work. Actually, your staff made trials of a number of formulations we were interested in, and they gave us samples for observation. Today our company, under free license from TVA, uses that information and some TVA polyphosphate with commercial wet-process acid in making low cost liquid fertilizer—lower than any other method available to small businesses such as ours. TVA has been the only source of a satisfactory sequestant which provides the only means for use of wet acid. We take very little credit for achievements in the field of production. We owe most of our success to TVA, and we believe that the industry should recognize TVA for making major contributions to liquid fertilizer technology—the use of which is considerably enhanced by your supplying new materials. Those of us too small to afford technical staffs are particularly grateful recipients of your development information.

Formerly, when majors were in the business of selling independents raw materials, they supplied technical information and did product development work for their customers, the independents. Now, this activity is largely proprietary. So another concern is our inability to keep up in new product development. We, and most of the other small independent fertilizer manufacturers, are almost entirely dependent upon TVA for this important function.

Will we be able to depend on TVA in the future to supply materials not available from industry, and to carry out research and do product development work for the small companies who have no facilities for this type activity? The answer to the above will have considerable bearing on our future planning. We will appreciate your carefully considered opinion.

Sincerely yours,
NELSON O. ABELL,
President.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE SITUATIONS IN VIETNAM AND THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, this morning the President of the

May 4, 1965

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

9035

United States called to the White House members of three important committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives. He pointed out to them the reasons why he felt it necessary for this Nation to stand firm in Vietnam and to evacuate civilians of this Nation and others who were caught in the unfortunate situation that developed in the Dominican Republic.

The President went into considerable detail to explain the problems in both those instances and indicated how much he felt the support of the Congress and of the American people was needed in the effort of the Chief Executive to maintain peace in the world and in defending those who have common interests with us against Communist subversion and Communist overthrow.

This Senator was pleased to see the standing ovation from the large number of Representatives and Senators who were members of those important committees when the President explained this Nation's position and the steps that had been taken to seek peace and to preserve the liberty of this Nation and that of friendly nations.

The President asked that we appropriate an additional \$700 million to pay the expense of the defense of freedom in Vietnam and in the Dominican Republic.

I am pleased to see that congressional leaders—both in the Senate and in the House—have given assurances that the President's request will be considered in short order. I would hope no Member of Congress would vote to deny our men the necessary weapons and support to carry out their orders to protect this Nation's vital interests. Therefore, I hope that Congress will vote for the appropriation by an overwhelming majority.

The show of unity behind the President's position in providing funds for these basic needs and for our fighting forces will make an impression on those who think that through terrorist tactics, by the murder of innocent civilians, by attack on our installations, they can keep pressure on this Nation, and that by so doing they will cause this Nation to capitulate in its efforts to preserve freedom and to preserve the position of all free nations on the earth.

There are some who differ with the President's policies. Perhaps some can find some reason for disagreement in one detail or another. But there is no doubt in my mind that the overwhelming majority of the American people and the overwhelming majority of Members of the Congress stand solidly behind the President in his efforts to see that no more nations are taken over by the Communist conspiracy in this hemisphere, and that the commitment this Nation has made to preserve freedom around the world will be honored.

Some people understand Americans better than others. There have been a number of showdowns with the Communists who control the Soviet Union. As a result of the firmness which we have evidenced and which their embassies and agents reported back to those in charge in the Soviet Union, I believe they under-

stand the courage, the determination, and conviction of the American people, as well as our commitment to our freedom.

I believe we have persuaded them by our firm position in Berlin, and by the firm position this Nation took in Turkey, Greece, and Cuba, that this Nation will fight. It will fight any sort of war that may be necessary to preserve freedom in this world.

As much as we love peace, we love freedom and liberty even more. Therefore, we have reason to hope and believe that it will not be necessary to engage in a general war with the only power on earth really capable of waging general war against the United States. We do not wish to engage in such a war, and we believe that they do not. As long as they know that America will stand up with courage, under any circumstances, to protect its vital interests and its liberties, we have every reason to believe that such a war can be avoided.

Sometimes the United States gains the impression that the Chinese Communists still remain to be convinced. We do not wish to use any more force than necessary to convince that huge nation that we seek no war with anyone, but that we will defend the areas we are committed to defend and will defend them with whatever force may be necessary. I believe that the Chinese Communists are coming to the conviction that that is, indeed, the position of the United States. They are coming to understand us a little better as a result of the strong position which the President has taken in regard to South Vietnam.

Sometimes, unfortunately, the press makes it appear—and perhaps some Senators and Representatives also make it appear—that America does not have the determination to stand fast, and that if the pressure is kept up against us, we might relent in our determination to defend freedom.

In my judgment, anyone who believes that is greatly mistaken. A minority which might differ with the President's views can sometimes be made to look much larger and more influential than it is, but Congress has voted on this issue time and again, and by huge majorities has voted the funds to continue the operation of our armed services to carry on the defense of freedom and prevent enslavement by aggressors from any source whatsoever.

Consequently, I applaud the President's statement this morning. I was pleased to notice that he received overwhelming standing applause from the more than 100 Senators and Representatives who listened to the explanation of his position.

There is no doubt in my mind that the appropriation recommended by the President will receive overwhelming support, that while some Senators may differ in small degree, all Senators share the same desire as to what the United States ultimately wishes; namely, peace. I believe that the great majority of Senators are completely satisfied that even though some may have minor differences as to

the precise measure that should be used to defend freedom, few, if any, would have the United States renege on its commitments. Few, if any, Members of the Senate and House of Representatives would have America stand idly by at the prospect of a friendly nation being overwhelmed and driven into some form of Communist slavery, and do nothing to help that friendly nation defend its liberties.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Let me compliment my friend the assistant majority leader for his great foresight and understanding of the situation which confronts us in Vietnam. I am happy to know that he has uttered words of support for the President and the President's request for \$700 million additional for the Armed Forces of our Nation.

As the Senate knows, I have just returned from Vietnam. I have talked with the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] on this subject. It was an uplifting experience to witness the reaction of Members of Congress to the President's explanation of his position, one of the most heartening and encouraging events I have ever witnessed.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The President made a statement this morning which has been made by many others. I do not claim that the President is the first one to have said it, but I know he fully believes that whenever this Nation has stood firm, particularly when we have armed ourselves adequate to the task and let it be known that we would do whatever was necessary to defend freedom, we have prevailed. We have had difficulty when we left our antagonists in doubt as to our intentions. Our adversaries are beginning to have some understanding that American thought in this field has crystallized to the extent that Americans know the President has a great burden upon his shoulders, and the country will support him.

Mr. DODD. I quite agree with the able and distinguished Senator from Louisiana. He and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], also know that I have recently completed an extensive tour of the Far East, which has given me the opportunity to obtain a first-hand look at the war in Vietnam, what I call the auxiliary war in Laos, and the Indonesian confrontation with Malaysia.

At a later date, I will report to the Senate in more detail on that trip.

In anticipation of the more complete statement which I intend to present, I want to say at this juncture that the war in Vietnam is now going much better for our side.

There are many evidences of this.

The Vietnamese Armed Forces have in recent months inflicted very heavy losses on the Vietcong. The Government forces are taking more prisoners, capturing more weapons, receiving more defec-

May 4, 1965

born, unearthing more Communist caches of arms and ammunition and rice.

There are certain parts of the country where the situation is still precarious. But there are important regions which have witnessed dramatic improvement.

I spent the better part of a week in Vietnam and in Laos, moving from point to point by helicopter and plane. I had lengthy discussions with many of the people in that area, with our great Ambassador, Maxwell Taylor—who, I believe is one of the truly great Americans of our time—and with his brilliant assistant, Alexis Johnson, and members of the Embassy staff; with General Westmoreland and his senior officers. As the Senator from Mississippi knows, he is one of our really outstanding great soldiers, a man of great character and ability. I also had a lengthy discussion with Prime Minister Quat and his cabinet.

I was impressed and, indeed, deeply moved, by the dedication of our Embassy personnel, our AID officials, and the American officers and GI's serving in Vietnam.

There are no faint hearts among the Americans in Vietnam, no voices crying for withdrawal because the war is too difficult or the burden too great.

On the contrary, everyone I met in Vietnam, from Ambassador Taylor and General Westmoreland down to the rank of private, was convinced that the war could be won and determined that it must be won.

I met many soldiers from Connecticut at the Danang airbase. I talked with them alone. Their officers were not present. Our soldiers know why they are in Vietnam. They wish to stay there. This made such a deep impression upon me that I shall never forget it.

Volunteers man the helicopters—helicopters with open doors, machineguns at hand, leaning out and guarding against the Communist Vietcong. They are all volunteer American soldiers, every single one of them. Not one of them ever said that he wished to go home. I heard that some had asked to have their tour of duty extended so that they could stay on the job.

I also wish to tell the Senator from Louisiana and the Senator from Mississippi and all my colleagues in the Senate that wherever I went in Asia I met with the most enthusiastic approval of President Johnson's twin commitment to freedom and peace in southeast Asia. Indeed, I am convinced that American prestige among the countries of the Far East has never been higher than it is today. I talked with heads of state in every country. I talked with our people there. I talked with many other people. I tried to see and hear as much as I could.

I asked those people, "What do you think? Do you think what we are doing is on the right track?" Without exception the answer was, "Yes." It was unanimously in the affirmative.

They are all outstanding people, and they are doing an outstanding job for the free world.

I earnestly hope that Congress will move expeditiously to appropriate the supplementary funds requested by the President.

Mr. President, I would like to say a few words, too, about the situation in the Dominican Republic because I am convinced that it represents a Communist maneuver to divert some of our attention and some of our forces from Vietnam.

I believe that the overwhelming majority of the American people heartily applaud President Johnson's prompt and courageous action in dealing with the Dominican crisis.

So long as there appeared to be a possibility that the revolution was simply directed against the military junta, President Johnson adhered to a hands-off policy. But when it became clear beyond the possibility of doubt that hard-core Communist elements were in effective control of both the political and military aspects of the revolution, the President was confronted with an invidious choice—a choice which no President of the United States could have resolved in another manner.

The free nations of the Americas cannot afford a second Cuba in the Caribbean Sea. A Castro regime in the Dominican Republic would constitute a grave long-term threat to the security of all our nations; and an immediate threat to the political stability of the Latin nations of the hemisphere.

The great majority of those who participated in the Dominican revolution are certainly not Communists. But the hard experience of Cuba teaches us that a handful of Communists occupying the command positions can impose their will in defiance of a disorganized, undisciplined, democratic majority.

I wish to present for the consideration of my colleagues a few essential facts which I received from an authoritative source concerning the Communist role in the Dominican crisis.

Among the rebel forces, and playing an important role in organizing the rebels as well as carrying on much of the paramilitary action are 58 identified, prominent Communist and Castroist leaders.

They include 18 persons known or reliably reported to have been trained in subversive and paramilitary tactics by the Cuban Intelligence Service or other similar Cuban organizations; and 40 who have been reliably and clearly identified over the past few years as Communist and Castroist subversives.

Playing a key role in the tactical direction of the rebel forces is Manuel Gonzalez-Gonzalez, an experienced Spanish Communist Party activist who has been working with the Dominican Communist Party for at least the past 2 years.

There are three Communist political organizations involved. They are the Partido Socialista Popular Dominicano—PSPD, Dominican Popular Socialist Party—which follows Moscow's direction; the Movimiento Popular Dominicano—MPD, Dominican Popular Movement—a small but aggressive Marxist-Leninist revolutionary party which follows the Chinese Communist ideological line; and, the Agrupacion Politica Catorce de Junio—APCJ, 14th of June political group—the largest of the three which is known to have connections with

the Soviet, Cuban and Communist Chinese regimes.

Following the coup against former President Bosch in 1963, the APCJ and the MPD launched an open guerrilla warfare movement in the hinterland of the Dominican Republic.

Some Dominicans known to have received training in Cuba took part in that abortive effort.

The bulk of the captured rebels were deported in May 1964, and most of them became political exiles in France. From there, many have since traveled in the Soviet bloc countries, including Cuba, and Communist China, returning to the Dominican Republic recently.

Since they were generally leaders of ability and standing, and moreover had the benefit of recent training and orientation, they have been able to reorganize their parties in preparation for an opportunity such as the present crisis presents.

At the outset of the coup d'etat attempt, within 1 or 2 hours of the first rebel moves, members of the Castroist June 14 movement were already busy in the streets of Santo Domingo calling on the populace to come out and demonstrate in favor of the call for restoration of constitutional government by ex-President Bosch.

Communist and Castroist leaders shortly thereafter got quantities of arms and ammunition from the magazines of the "27 February" Camp outside Santo Domingo, where rebelling Army officers had seized control as the opening act of the coup.

A sizable quantity of arms and ammunition fell into the hands of leaders of the PSPD—orthodox Communists—and the members of this party were quickly formed into armed paramilitary teams which fanned out in the downtown and "barrio"—slum—areas, taking control of secondary targets and organizing the inhabitants.

Such PSPD leaders as Buenaventura Johnson and Fidelio Despradel were particularly active in organizing these teams.

At the same time a party military headquarters was established and arms collected from loyalist police and military were stored there. Other strongpoints were organized.

Also leading the organization of extreme leftist-paramilitary units were Jaime Duran, who received paramilitary training in Cuba in 1962, and Juan Ducoudray, who has been a liaison link between Cuba and the Dominican Republic for the supply of weapons.

All of these actions are believed to have been directed under the generalship of Manuel Gonzalez Gonzalez.

With their relatively tight discipline and effective organization, the extreme leftist groups, particularly the PSPD, but also, prominently, the MPD and the June 14 movement, were soon providing a significant portion of the rebel forces and were decisively influencing the political leadership of the rebellion which, in the beginning, had been in the hands of the Bosch party leaders.

Extreme leftists took control of Radio Santo Domingo and operated in typical Castro style, parading captured loyalists

before television cameras and haranguing viewers with slogans and denunciations of "the bourgeois reactionaries, imperialists," and so forth.

By April 27 the provisional government formed by Rafael Molina Urena contained members and officials who were either established Communists or Castroist personages or had histories of association with the extreme left. Among these were Luis H. Lajarte Gonzalez, a Trujilloist who subsequently switched to the Castroist camp, and Alfredo Gonsa Pansa, a well-known sympathizer with the PSPD, whose two sons are PSPD members.

This was the complexion of the rebellion when the original PRD leaders, who had organized the revolt to restore Bosch, realizing that their movement had been captured by the Castroist and Communist left, took asylum and by this action renounced their by now largely nominal leadership.

There is little room for doubt that the PRD civilian leaders of the revolt, with the exception of Bosch—who is not in the scene and lacks firsthand knowledge—have all at least privately recognized the capture of their revolt by the extreme left. No civilian PRD leaders of any significance remain with the rebels. Most if not all have taken sanctuary in various embassies and private houses in Santo Domingo.

Rafael Molina Urena is in asylum in the Colombian Embassy.

Jose Francisco Pena Gomez is in hiding in the home of a friend.

Martinez Francisco, PRD secretary general, publicly exhorted the rebels to lay down their arms.

After he had withdrawn from the revolt and taken refuge, Pena Gomez, who had been one of the chief architects of the revolt, informed an American Embassy officer that he considered his movement to have been defeated. He said that the Communists who joined the rebel force infiltrated into positions of importance and that it was very difficult to stop them. In his withdrawal, Pena recognized that the only other alternative would have been to support a barefaced Castroist grab for power.

This recognition was summed up implicitly by the PRD secretary general, Martinez Francisco, in his radio address to the nation from San Isidro on April 28:

I beg all to lay down their arms, turning them in to the nearest military post, because this is no longer a fight between political parties.

It is only against this background that President Johnson decided that he had no alternative but to intervene.

It is my earnest hope that the Organization of American States will heed the President's request and will at an early date dispatch an Inter-American force to the Dominican Republic for the purpose of restoring order in that unhappy country and of creating the conditions essential for stable and democratic government.

Meanwhile, I hope the Senate will move rapidly to demonstrate that in the cause of freedom we are prepared to pay any price.

I have said, because I believe it to be true, that the outbreak in the Dominican Republic is directly tied to our struggle in southeast Asia to defend the freedom and independence of the people of Vietnam.

I predict that we can expect more of this in one place after another and that we must be prepared for it, and that we must do everything in our power to strengthen the President's hand.

If we do not now stand strong, we shall stand weak at a later and more terrible hour.

Some friends have said to me, "Laos and Vietnam do not seem to be the right place."

In reply I have said, "They will have to do. There is no better place, and it is best that we make our stand now."

As the Senator from Louisiana has so well pointed out, every time we have stood firm, we have come out all right. And I am confident that we shall come out all right this time if we stand firm—in Vietnam, in Laos, in the Dominican Republic, all around the world, with our free friends and allies.

The President is not only committed to standing firm, as he has amply demonstrated, but he is committed just as strongly to this quest for peace.

I recall that I was in Korea and, later in the same day, in Taiwan, when the President made his speech in Baltimore about unconditional discussions.

The headlines had to do with that part of his speech in which he spoke of unconditional discussions. They ignored the President's total commitment to the freedom of Vietnam and southeast Asia. I said to those who expressed misgivings, "Read the whole speech." Of course, we are for unconditional discussions because we are ready at any time to sit down and talk with those who are in a position to stop this fighting and to end this war with justice for all.

That is our hope and our only purpose; and it should never be understood as a weakness.

I could not be more pleased that he is. No man wants war. No man wants to see people killed. But no man wants to see the whole world committed to Communist slavery. That, I believe, is the issue.

So I join with the Senator from Louisiana in his support of the President. I shall do all I can to help bring about the quick enactment of the proposed legislation which he has requested.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut has made a fine contribution to this Nation's foreign policy. It is an honor to serve with him on the Foreign Relations Committee. His recommendations down through the years have been wise. He has advocated that we stand firm in the face of aggression. His philosophy generally has meant that when those who would destroy and deny freedom strike us, we should strike back harder. If they should strike again, we should strike back even harder. That is the policy that our Nation is pursuing. We do not wish to use any more force than is necessary, but we shall use whatever force is necessary to defend freedom in this world. Our enemies should

be well aware that when they decide to resort to additional methods to destroy freedom and strike at additional nations, we expect to use other measures available to us. I hope that we can have more help and support from friendly nations which realize this problem.

At the present time our Nation is doing its job and is doing it well. We shall succeed because we have a leader who has the vision, the courage, and the wisdom to realize what our problem is, and because the people have the good judgment to follow that leader.

Mr. DODD. I should like to add one thing: if the Senator will yield further—

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. DODD. I think it would be of great interest to the Senator from Louisiana and to the Senator from Mississippi.

I have heard in the Senate Chamber. I have read in our newspapers, I have heard on the radio, and I have heard people on television say, "These people in Vietnam do not have any interest in freedom. They are not willing to fight for themselves."

I was astonished, amazed, and proud to learn that 80 percent of the armed forces of South Vietnam are volunteers. That is something to think about in any country. They have suffered terrible losses but they inflicted much greater losses on the enemy.

I was amazed, also, to hear from our Air Force people. I asked them, "Do they have any pilots?"

They said, "Do they have any pilots? They have about 800 crack pilots and they will soon have more than 1,000. And they are wonderful pilots."

More importantly, perhaps, they told me that their record on the maintenance and serviceability of aircraft is at least as good as ours. That is something to think about—these people of whom it is said that they do not wish to fight for their freedom.

I went into some little hamlets and villages where I met the mayors and the village chiefs, and I found that in most instances the third or fourth or even the sixth or seventh in the line of succession. Their predecessors have had their throats cut by the Communists in Vietcong attacks, most of the time at night.

So I said to one of them, "You are a pretty brave fellow. Where I come from it would be hard to find a community in which you could get a man to run for mayor when five of his predecessors had had their throats cut." And I think it is true.

But they do not have trouble finding replacements in Vietnam.

This is the kind of people with whom we are fighting, and I think that the American people ought to know it.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It is also important to realize that for every casualty we have suffered, for every American who has lost his life in Vietnam, many Vietnamese have sacrificed their lives in attempting to defend freedom. I believe their loss of lives have run about 20,000 killed. This would indicate that 20 lives of Vietnamese have been sacrificed on the altar of freedom for every one that our Nation has given in defending free-

dom against Communist enslavement in that area.

Mr. DODD. That does not take into account the thousands who have been kidnaped. The kidnaping that is going on in this war is a terrible thing. The Communists move in at night. They grab the children and the wives of these brave people and take them off. God knows where, probably never to be heard from again.

Most men would rather die than suffer that disaster. But those men continue the fight.

Our people have no idea of what is going on in this distant place from us or of the courage of those who are continuing to fight on with our support.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I commend the Senator from Connecticut for his decision to go to Vietnam and the other areas he visited. I feel that he has rendered his country, the Congress, and, more particularly, the Senate, a great service. I am one of those who look forward to his formal speech, in which he will give us a report and a comprehensive review of his impressions as well as his recommendations. He is peculiarly fitted to go, and I think he has served his country well. I hope that the Senator can deliver his speech some time soon, with some prior advance notice.

Mr. DODD. I assure the Senator I shall do so.

I am deeply grateful for the Senator's compliment. I do not deserve it, but I am vain enough to enjoy it.

Mr. STENNIS. It is quite a chore which the Senator performed, from a physical standpoint. His services are valuable.

If the Senator from Louisiana will yield to me further, I should like to commend him for his remarks with reference to Vietnam and the bill which we shall shortly consider with reference to a proposed special authorization and appropriation, and the firmness of the stand of the President, not only with reference to Vietnam, but also in reference to the Dominican Republic. Such firm stands put us on the way to a better position, not only for us, but also the world. I look forward to his presentation in the Senate when those questions arise. The Senator's remarks were very good indeed. I do not believe that we have anything to fear so long as we follow a policy of decision, firmness, and action, although, of course, we certainly do not wish any more war or bloodshed than is absolutely necessary.

But we are certainly living in troublous times, and we must meet the situations as they arise, like them or not. I believe that this time we will.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to join in the well-deserved compliment that the Senator from Mississippi has paid to the Senator from Connecticut. I agree with him 100 percent that the Senator from Connecticut has rendered the Nation a great service.

Likewise, the Senator from Mississippi has rendered the country valiant

service during the illness of our great and revered chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. Russell). During the recovery of Senator RICHARD RUSSELL from his illness, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) has been serving as the acting chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and has done so in an outstanding manner. I have had the opportunity to hear him manage bills that have come from the Committee on Armed Services. He is carrying on in a style of which the Nation can be proud. I know that our distinguished chairman (Mr. Russell) will join me in expressing gratitude to the Senator from Mississippi for the excellent work he has done as acting chairman of the Committee on Armed Services during this period.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. We are delighted to know that Senator Russell's health is improving, and we look forward to his early return. The Senator from Georgia started on my service on the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from Louisiana was himself a valued member of that committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was a great honor for me to serve on the Committee on Armed Services. I was a desk mate of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), whose sound judgment transcended party lines with respect to our military and foreign relations problems throughout the years. I appreciate what he has said.

I believe it should also be noted for the Record that the President of the United States, before sending American troops to the Dominican Republic, day after day called upon the contending sides for a ceasefire. He did not want to send American troops to the Dominican Republic. But neither did he want to see innocent men, women, and children—civilians—who were not parties to the contending sides of that struggle, needlessly sacrificed.

Also, the President did not want to see a Communist takeover of that island. He sought to avoid that by sending American troops and by repeatedly calling for a ceasefire prior to the sending of those troops. It was only when a ceasefire could not be arranged that the President decided it was necessary to use American troops.

As one Member of this body—and I think I speak generally on behalf of the Senate—I believe it would have been preferable that forces of the Organization of American States should have been available to accomplish the task which this Nation has found it necessary to undertake. We hope, even at this point, that the Organization of American States, through the governments acting individually, will be able to participate in restoring democratic government to the Dominican people.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two significant items which

appeared in the press last Wednesday, April 28. The first is an article captioned "Field Commander Johnson," written by the veteran columnist, Joseph Alsop. The second is an editorial bearing caption "Bridges Versus People." It was published on the same date in the Washington Daily News.

Mr. Alsop, in his article, describes intense personal interest which the President, as commander in chief, is devoted to the conduct of the Vietnamese war. He points out that all targets are personally approved by the President, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense. He says that when planes have gone on a mission, the President will frequently stay awake until he has himself called, so that he can hear the results of the mission as soon as it is completed.

When pilots are missing—

Mr. Alsop wrote—

he has been known to stay awake through the small hours, to sweat out the final recovery of the missing men by the air rescue service.

From my recent travels around Asia, I concur wholeheartedly in Mr. Alsop's estimate that the President "looms much larger in the world today than on the day of his triumphant reelection."

Everywhere I traveled in the Far East, I was met with the conviction that the free world has found a leader with the mettle to match that of the men of Moscow and Peking.

The Washington Daily News editorial referred to President Johnson's expression of wonderment over people who are more disturbed by our bombing of bridges in North Vietnam than they are over Vietcong murders of women and children. I share fully the President's wonderment; and this is a subject to which I intend to address myself at an early date on the floor of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, April 28, 1965.]

FIELD COMMANDER JOHNSON

(By Joseph Alsop)

For members of the White House staff, a fairly common morning greeting now is a hint that they are slug-a-beds come to their master, who is perfectly likely to announce: "I was up at 5, waiting to be sure that all my boys got back from mission."

It is hard to believe, but it is a fact that the President follows the bombing mission, tracking targets in North Vietnam almost the manner of a field commander.

He is customarily notified when planes have gone out. He often stays or has himself called, or is awakened by his own internal alarm clock, to hear the mission's results. And when pilots are missing, he has been known to stay awake through the small hours to sweat out the final recovery of the missing men by the air rescue service.

All this is decidedly sympathetic, although someone ought to persuade the President that it is quite unnecessary. He has been looking a bit tired recently, and now for his new role as a field commander, operations halfway around the world clearly cut substantially into his minimal daily allowance of rest.

But persuading Lyndon B. Johnson to mend his ways, for his own good or for

May 4, 1965

dom against Communist enslavement in that area.

Mr. DODD. That does not take into account the thousands who have been kidnaped. The kidnaping that is going on in this war is a terrible thing. The Communists move in at night. They grab the children and the wives of these brave people and take them off. God knows where, probably never to be heard from again.

Most men would rather die than suffer that disaster. But those men continue the fight.

Our people have no idea of what is going on in this distant place from us or of the courage of those who are continuing to fight on with our support.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. I commend the Senator from Connecticut for his decision to go to Vietnam and the other areas he visited. I feel that he has rendered his country, the Congress, and, more particularly, the Senate, a great service. I am one of those who look forward to his formal speech, in which he will give us a report and a comprehensive review of his impressions as well as his recommendations. He is peculiarly fitted to go, and I think he has served his country well. I hope that the Senator can deliver his speech some time soon, with some prior advance notice.

Mr. DODD. I assure the Senator I shall do so.

I am deeply grateful for the Senator's compliment. I do not deserve it, but I am vain enough to enjoy it.

Mr. STENNIS. It is quite a chore which the Senator performed, from a physical standpoint. His services are valuable.

If the Senator from Louisiana will yield to me further, I should like to commend him for his remarks with reference to Vietnam and the bill which we shall shortly consider with reference to a proposed special authorization and appropriation, and the firmness of the stand of the President, not only with reference to Vietnam, but also in reference to the Dominican Republic. Such firm stands put us on the way to a better position, not only for us, but also the world. I look forward to his presentation in the Senate when those questions arise. The Senator's remarks were very good indeed. I do not believe that we have anything to fear so long as we follow a policy of decision, firmness, and action, although, of course, we certainly do not wish any more war or bloodshed than is absolutely necessary.

But we are certainly living in troublous times, and we must meet the situations as they arise, like them or not. I believe that this time we will.

I thank the Senator from Louisiana for yielding to me.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I wish to join in the well-deserved compliment that the Senator from Mississippi has paid to the Senator from Connecticut. I agree with him 100 percent that the Senator from Connecticut has rendered the Nation a great service.

Likewise, the Senator from Mississippi has rendered the country valiant

service during the illness of our great and revered chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia (Mr. RUSSELL). During the recovery of Senator RICHARD RUSSELL from his illness, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) has been serving as the acting chairman of the Committee on Armed Services and has done so in an outstanding manner. I have had the opportunity to hear him manage bills that have come from the Committee on Armed Services. He is carrying on in a style of which the Nation can be proud. I know that our distinguished chairman (Mr. RUSSELL) will join me in expressing gratitude to the Senator from Mississippi for the excellent work he has done as acting chairman of the Committee on Armed Services during this period.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. We are delighted to know that Senator RUSSELL's health is improving, and we look forward to his early return. The Senator from Georgia started on my service on the Committee on Armed Services.

The Senator from Louisiana was himself a valued member of that committee.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. It was a great honor for me to serve on the Committee on Armed Services. I was a desk mate of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), whose sound judgment transcended party lines with respect to our military and foreign relations problems throughout the years. I appreciate what he has said.

I believe it should also be noted for the Record that the President of the United States, before sending American troops to the Dominican Republic, day after day called upon the contending sides for a ceasefire. He did not want to send American troops to the Dominican Republic. But neither did he want to see innocent men, women, and children—civilians—who were not parties to the contending sides of that struggle, needlessly sacrificed.

Also, the President did not want to see a Communist takeover of that island. He sought to avoid that by sending American troops and by repeatedly calling for a ceasefire prior to the sending of those troops. It was only when a ceasefire could not be arranged that the President decided it was necessary to use American troops.

As one Member of this body—and I think I speak generally on behalf of the Senate—I believe it would have been preferable that forces of the Organization of American States should have been available to accomplish the task which this Nation has found it necessary to undertake. We hope, even at this point, that the Organization of American States, through the governments acting individually, will be able to participate in restoring democratic government to the Dominican people.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND VIETNAM

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record two significant items which

appeared in the press last Wednesday, April 28. The first is an article captioned "Field Commander Johnson," written by the veteran columnist, Joseph Alsop. The second is an editorial bearing the caption "Bridges Versus People." It was published on the same date in the Washington Daily News.

Mr. Alsop, in his article, describes the intense personal interest which the President, as commander in chief, is devoting to the conduct of the Vietnamese war. He points out that all targets are personally approved by the President, in consultation with the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense. He says that when planes have gone on a mission, the President will frequently stay awake or will have himself called, so that he can hear the results of the mission as soon as it is completed.

When pilots are missing—

Mr. Alsop wrote—

he has been known to stay awake through the small hours, to sweat out the final recovery of the missing men by the air-sea rescue service.

From my recent travels around Asia, I concur wholeheartedly in Mr. Alsop's estimate that the President "looms much larger in the world today than on the day of his triumphant reelection."

Everywhere I traveled in the Far East, I was met with the conviction that the free world has found a leader with a mettle to match that of the men of Moscow and Peking.

The Washington Daily News editorial referred to President Johnson's expressed wonderment over people who are more disturbed by our bombing of bridges in North Vietnam than they are over the Vietcong murders of women and children. I share fully the President's wonderment; and this is a subject to which I intend to address myself at an early date on the floor of the Senate.

There being no objection, the article and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 28, 1965]

FIELD COMMANDER JOHNSON

(By Joseph Alsop)

For members of the White House staff, a fairly common morning greeting nowadays is a hint that they are slug-a-beds compared to their master, who is perfectly likely to announce: "I was up at 5, waiting to make sure that all my boys got back from that mission."

It is hard to believe, but it is a fact that the President follows the bombing missions attacking targets in North Vietnam almost in the manner of a field commander.

He is customarily notified when the planes have gone out. He often stays up, or has himself called, or is awakened by his own internal alarm clock, to hear the mission's results. And when pilots are missing, he has been known to stay awake through the small hours to sweat out the final recovery of the missing men by the air-sea rescue service.

All this is decidedly sympathetic, although someone ought to persuade the President that it is quite unnecessary. He has been looking a bit tired recently, and no wonder. For his new role as a field commander of operations halfway around the world must clearly cut substantially into his always minimal daily allowance of rest.

But persuading Lyndon B. Johnson to mend his ways, for his own good or for any

May 4, 1965

9039

other reason, has always been an uphill task. The significant point to note is that the President, in some sense, really is the field commander of these remote, delicate, and crucial military operations.

All targets are, in the first place, personally approved by him, in committee with the Secretaries of State and Defense. The operational plans for each attack, the choice between approved targets dictated by weather and other considerations, the estimates of forces needed for each mission—all these matters, very naturally and properly, are left to the air officers and naval officers on the spot, who have direct operational responsibility.

But even the decisions about these matters, when reached, are also reported to the President promptly and in detail. He and Secretary of Defense McNamara keep a minutely close watch on the whole process, particularly including contingent orders to the pilots participating in the missions, about what to do if, for example, they encounter Chinese fighter aircraft—as they have done once already over the Gulf of Tonkin.

It is a striking proof of the increased political maturity of the American armed services, that there has been no grumbling or sneering about this "black seat driving," as it would surely have been called in the old days. The military leaders have seen that these operations are as much political as military. Hence there has been nothing even remotely resembling the tantrums of the higher naval command in the second Cuban crisis.

The military leaders are not the only persons who have changed markedly, however. The phenomenon is hard to define, but these last months have clearly somewhat changed the President himself.

Perhaps the best clue is the familiar experience of the man who has never been in combat; who goes into combat with the self-doubts that any normal man feels in these circumstances; and who then finds he can do

what needs doing in a quite satisfactory manner. This is a truly liberating experience, as all know who have had it.

Like the man who has never been in combat, President Johnson before Pleiku had never taken quite the sort of decision that he took when the attacks on North Vietnam were ordered at last. He now tells all and sundry that this decision involved no change of policy, that all had been foreseen, and so on and so on. Maybe he believes this himself. But, in fact, a very major Rubicon was crossed.

Crossing it gave the President none of the exhilaration that another sort of national leader might have felt. Being field commander now does not excite him as it would have excited Franklin Delano Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy. As someone or other remarked, "Johnson is not the sort of man who will collect ship models after he is out of office."

But one suspects, nonetheless, that he has somehow been liberated, and even enlarged, by making a cruelly hard decision that was foreign to his previous experience, and by taking a task in hand that is not really to his taste. Certainly he looms much larger in the world today than on the day of his triumphant reelection.

In Moscow and Peiping, in Paris, and in other quarters where it is desirable to have the President of the United States regarded as pretty formidable and not to be lightly tampered with, the upward revision of the going estimates of Lyndon Johnson has been almost an audible process. And rightly so, too; for he has removed that last doubt that with any luck at all, his time in office may prove to be one of the major Presidentialencies.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Daily News, Apr. 28, 1965]

BRIDGES VERSUS PEOPLE

President Johnson at his Tuesday press conference expressed wonderment that peo-

ple who are disturbed by our bombing of bridges in North Vietnam never seem to be upset by such events as the Communist bombing of our Embassy in Saigon nor by Vietcong murders of women and children.

That puzzles us, too.

There can be many arguments against war as an institution. But to condemn the use of force on one side, while condoning it on the other, must be either ridiculous or coldly cynical.

Nevertheless, a good many Americans—not a majority, to be sure—seem to have been caught up in this frenzy.

The fact is that the Communists are counting on just such a reaction in this country to help them achieve their goal. They believe our natural disinclination toward the use of force eventually will cause us to give in rather than fight to the finish in Vietnam.

As the President made clear, however, the Vietnam war is not going to conclude that way. We did not make the war, but we are there to stay. We are, in Mr. Johnson's words, not about to "tuck our tails and run home."

Meanwhile, it will be good for the American people to remember that, as the President indicated, it is more useful in war to blow up a cold steel bridge than to murder a child.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, in accordance with the previous order, until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 5, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse of Scripture:
Luke 12: 32: *Fear not, little flock; for it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom.*

Eternal God, when we deal honestly and sincerely with ourselves, we see how much of faith and fortitude, of patience and perseverance we daily need if we would follow Thy principles and spirit in our individual and social life.

May we be numbered among those whose inner life is redeemed from selfishness to a life of sympathy and service for the common good of mankind and the higher life of humanity.

Inspire us to give ourselves, with wholehearted dedication to the dawning of that better and brighter day when we shall cultivate a nobler skill in discovering and developing those capacities not only for a more splendid human personality but a finer social order.

Help us to give our plans and programs for the Great Society a more personal touch and may we be partners with all who would give vitality and validity to that lofty mission which is fruitful not only in an individual but in a social sense.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5702. An act to extend for 1 year the date on which the National Commission on Food Marketing shall make a final report to the President and to the Congress and to provide necessary authorization of appropriations for such Commission.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. MONRONEY and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 65-11.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

9040

CHILDREN OF MRS. ELIZABETH A. DOMBROWSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1291) for the relief of the children of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Dombrowski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1291

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each child of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Dombrowski, of Parma, Ohio, widow of Victor E. Dombrowski, of Parma, Ohio, the amount which the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs certifies to him would have been payable to each such child under section 542 of title 38 of the United States Code for the period from July 1, 1960, to the date which each such child actually began receiving a pension under such section: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CWO ELDEN R. COMER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1374) for the relief of CWO Elden R. Comer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1374

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Elden R. Comer, Route 3, Box 22, Orland, California, the sum of \$1,680.62 in full settlement of the claim of the said Elden R. Comer against the United States. A claim was timely executed by the claimant under date of March 28, 1955, as prepared by the Navy Finance Center, Cleveland, Ohio, but there is no record of any Government action thereon. A subsequent claim was filed October 18, 1962, and payment was made for all amounts not barred by the statute of limitations. The above referred principal amount is for the balance of retired pay owing for the barred period August 1946 to October 1952. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary

notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. NATHALIE ILINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1380) for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie Iline.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MRS. HELEN VESELENAK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1475) for the relief of Mrs. Helen Veselenak.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1475

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the requirements in section 202(h)(1)(B) and 202(p) of the Social Security Act that proof of support be filed by the dependent parent of an insured individual within a specified period after the date of such individual's death in order to qualify for parent's insurance benefits on the basis of such individual's wages and self-employment income shall not apply with respect to the application of Mrs. Helen Veselenak, Byesville, Ohio, for parent's insurance benefits under section 202(h) of such Act on the basis of the wages and self-employment income of her son Joseph Veselenak, Junior (social security account numbered 275-16-7991), if she files such application, together with such proof of support, within the six-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 3, after "requirements" insert "relating to time".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GERTRUDE RESKIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2155) for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Reskin.

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker I wish to express my great pleasure at the unanimous approval by the House yesterday of the Community Health Services Extension Amendments of 1965. I was on the floor of the House earlier in the afternoon and was in my office for the remainder of the day. I heard the first bells for a record vote on H.R. 2986, but the second bells did not ring in my part of the Old House Office Building and hence I missed the rollcall vote. I have reported this fact to those in charge of the bell signals, but I also want to record my strong approval and support for this legislation.

I was one of those who introduced legislation to create these community health centers, and it is this legislation enacted in 1963 which H.R. 2986 will extend and amend. Coming as I do from a district and a State with a substantial number of senior citizens and a burgeoning population, I am keenly aware of the need for Federal assistance to the total community in establishing facilities for meeting the health needs and especially the mental health needs of our people.

I voted for the extension of this program in the Rules Committee and strongly support it, and had I not by inadvertence been prevented from being on the floor I would have voted for H.R. 2986 with pride and personal satisfaction.

INTER-AMERICAN DEVELOPMENT BANK CONFERENCE IN PARAGUAY

(Mr. HALPERN asked and was given permission to address the House for one minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I was given leave of absence last week, having been assigned to serve as an official delegate to the Inter-American Development Bank Conference, in Paraguay.

During this period, certain issues were acted upon by the House, and I would like at this time to state the positions I would have taken, had I been present to vote on them.

I would have voted "yes" on rollcall No. 86, in favor of authorizing appropriations for the National Council on the Arts on an annual basis. I have long advocated such a Council and feel this legislation is most helpful to implement its admirable objectives.

I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 85, in support of Mr. KROGH's motion that the House recede from its disagreement with the Senate's addition of \$942,000 for subsidies for helicopter services in New York City, Los Angeles, and Chicago.

I would have voted "yea" on rollcall vote No. 82, for passage of the Water Quality Act of 1965. This, too, is extremely desirable legislation and is a long step forward in the fight on water pollution.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 78, and "yea" on rollcall No. 79, against recommitment, and for passage of H.R. 6497, the bill to increase the U.S. contribution to the International Monetary Fund. As a

member of the International Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, I attended the hearings on this bill, and strongly supported its enactment. The bill increases our quota to the International Monetary Fund by 25 percent, to a total of \$5,160 million. This increase will give the United States additional funds upon which to draw to alleviate our current short-run balance-of-payments deficit. This bill strengthens the International Monetary Fund, and thereby enhances the stability of exchange markets, and promotes international trade.

PRESIDENT'S REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL FUNDS

(Mr. DERWINSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, I am sure, will give immediate approval to the President's request for additional funds to cover Defense Department needs, despite the fact that President Johnson was inconsistent and disappointing in his public address to the assembled Members of Congress this morning.

It was most disappointing for me to hear the President discuss the crises in Vietnam and the Dominican Republic without stating that our policy is to completely remove the Communist menace to both of these countries. The President was laboriously carrying water on both shoulders in that he was asking Congress for additional military funds while literally begging the Communists to enter into negotiations.

It is inconsistent for us to have made the necessary and dramatic move in the Dominican Republic without logically developing a policy of completely eliminating Communist subversive activities in that country and reinstituting a program which would produce a legitimate government in Cuba, since the Castro government is directly involved in the Dominican revolt and in Red guerrilla activities in other Latin American lands.

Negotiations in Vietnam will be fruitless if they permit continued Communist subversion in Laos and Cambodia and leave North Vietnam as an unmolested Red bastion. If we are to follow our obligation to preserve peace with freedom for our allies in southeast Asia, enforcement of a policy which would prevent North Vietnam from supporting aggression is necessary.

The President is obviously weakening in the face of growing Communist pressure and the shrill cries of appeasement coming from many of his party's leading congressional figures. Therefore, it is necessary for the public and the Republican Members of Congress to reinvigorate the President's determination to maintain a strong stand in defense of our present commitments and to logically carry out a policy of thwarting all Communist activities in the Western Hemisphere. Furthermore, we must stop the Reds cold in southeast Asia and we cannot equivocate on that point.

STATEMENT OF PRESIDENT JAMES M. NABRIT, JR., OF HOWARD UNIVERSITY CONCERNING ORGANIZATION KNOWN AS STUDENTS FOR ACADEMIC FREEDOM

(Mr. MATTHEWS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I enclose for the record very interesting articles which appeared in the Washington Post on April 28, and in the U.S. News & World Report of May 10, and which quoted President James M. Nabrit, Jr., of Howard University, concerning an organization known as Students for Academic Freedom.

I want to congratulate President Nabrit for his forthright statement, and say that activities of this group have been called to my attention by other officials in other universities. I hope more university officials will express their opinions concerning this organization, because, as President Nabrit stated:

They must be unmasked for the frauds they are. They must be fought in every arena, and they must not be permitted to prevail.

The articles follow:

(From the Washington Post, Apr. 28, 1965)

HOWARD UNIVERSITY UNREST BLAMED ON OUTSIDE FORCES

(By Stephen O. Rogers)

President James M. Nabrit, Jr., of Howard University yesterday blamed recent unrest at Howard on a few students he believes may be influenced by "external disruptive forces."

"They are people who cloak themselves in the mantle of civil rights and plot and plan in secret to disrupt our fight for justice and full citizenship," Nabrit said in a statement approved by the university's board of trustees.

"They must be unmasked for the frauds they are. They must be fought in every arena, and they must not be permitted to prevail."

At a press conference yesterday, Nabrit said he was referring to the Students for Academic Freedom.

The group sponsored a demonstration at Howard last Friday to protest compulsory ROTC, class attendance rules and the University's action in changing the status of a philosophy professor. About 250 students gathered for the demonstration.

Nabrit said the demonstration violated no university rule, and the school has taken no steps to discipline its leaders.

"But," he warned, "I will not sit idly by and see the University become a place of lawlessness and disorder."

He added that on one occasion he saw two known Communists on a Student for Academic Freedom picket line.

Nabrit also expressed concern over "increasing evidence of a lack of respect for duly constituted authority" both at Howard and outside it.

Of protest demonstrations generally, he said "they are not the only answer. They are reaching a point of diminishing returns. We must adhere to a rule of law."

He also defended the Howard student body against apathy charges and said the university places "no restriction" on the right of students to demonstrate as individuals. Howard has not disciplined students arrested in demonstrations, he said.

Approved For Release 2003/10/14 : CIA-RDP67B00446R000300150006-7

[From the U.S. News & World Report, May 10, 1965]

More Campus Unrest—Are Reds to Blame?

WASHINGTON—Campus unrest has now broken out at Howard University, the Nation's biggest predominantly Negro college.

As on other troubled campuses, outside agitation and Communist influence are being cited.

Said Dr. James M. Nabrit, Jr., president of Howard: Outsiders may be infiltrating rights groups "to disrupt our fight for justice and full citizenship."

"OPEN DEFIANCE"

Howard has more than 9,000 students. Many leaders in national civil-rights organizations have come from its student body and faculty. Now, says Dr. Nabrit, there are "growing signs of open defiance of law and order" on the campus.

A group called Students for Academic Freedom, which includes some faculty members, has demonstrated against alleged repressive rules and regulations, and had demanded abolition of compulsory military training at the school.

In a statement read to a freshman assembly, Dr. Nabrit said a campaign seemed to be afoot "to bring the university into general disrepute."

"I will not sit idly by and see the university become a place of lawlessness and disorder," he said.

"We must beware of some people who come to us like the Greeks bearing gifts. They do not believe in civil rights for anyone."

"They are children of lawlessness and disciples of destruction."

"They are people who cloak themselves in the roles of civil-rights and plot and plan in secret to disrupt our fight for justice and full citizenship."

"They must be unmasked for the frauds they are. They must be fought in every arena, and they must not be permitted to prevail."

REDS IN A PICKET LINE

Dr. Nabrit's statement was approved by the university's board of trustees. Discussing it in a later news conference, he said he had seen at least two Communists in a picket line outside the school. Excerpts of his remarks, as recorded by NBC-TV:

"I saw some Communists passing out throwaways. I saw some Communists helping deliver placards. . . . These are grown people; they're not students."

"They have never denied that they were Communists, and they have been the leaders in the Communist group in Washington all the years I've been here. We had to put them out of the NAACP."

Dr. Nabrit said that Howard may have been designated as the target for the kind of outside agitation that stirred outbreaks at the University of California's Berkeley campus.

"I don't see any relationship whatsoever to the civil rights movement at Berkeley or here," he said. "I don't see that it's got anything to do with the civil rights movement. At Howard, everybody from the president on down has been participating in civil rights."

COMMUNISM AND MARTIN LUTHER KING

(Mr. WAGGONER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to include an editorial.)

Mr. WAGGONER. Mr. Speaker, the association of men and organizations with Communist leanings with the leaders of the civil rights movement is well known to those in authority, but the connections are very seldom made known to the people.

In an effort to circumvent the news blackout on this vital subject, I plan, from time to time, to make these associations known by publishing them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, where censorship cannot erase the facts from public view.

The first of these insertions concerns the Communist Party and Martin Luther King and appeared in the current issue of the National Review Bulletin, volume 17, No. 19.

Today's award for throwing the baby out with the bathwater goes to the U.S. Supreme Court for its 5-3 decision overturning Louisiana's Subversive Activities and Communist Control Act. The Court heard, and apparently agreed with, arguments that the Act had been used to "harass" civil rights activities. The case concerned the Southern Conference Education Fund, which assists civil rights groups, especially the Students Nonviolent Coordinating Committee ("SNCC").

According to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, SCEF is the successor to the Southern Conference for Human Welfare, which was "conceived, financed, and set up by the Communist Party in 1933 as a mass organization to promote communism throughout the Southern States."

When the SCHW became the SCEF in 1948, it retained its offices, telephone, publication (the Southern Patriot, also cited as subversive), and officers, all but one of whom have been identified under oath as Communists.

Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth, a militant leftist and close colleague of Martin Luther King, is now president of SCEF, but it is for the most part operated by Carl and Anne Braden, both of whom have been identified in sworn testimony as Communists.

Mrs. Braden is editor of the Southern Patriot. On October 5, 1963, after an 11-month investigation, SCEF's offices in New Orleans were raided by local and State police who seized a truckload of its records and arrested three of its officers, acting on the authority of the Communist Control Act. The action before the Supreme Court evolved from SCEF's efforts to recover these records. In the meantime, the Louisiana State Committee on Un-American Activities, also authorized by the act, prepared an excellent two-volume report on SCEF's activities, extensively documenting Communist involvement in the civil rights movement.

When the SCHW became the SCEF in 1948, it retained its offices, telephone, publication (the Southern Patriot, also cited as subversive), and officers, all but one of whom have been identified under oath as Communists.

Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth, a militant leftist and close colleague of Martin Luther King, is now president of SCEF, but it is for the most part operated by Carl and Anne Braden, both of whom have been identified in sworn testimony as Communists.

Mrs. Braden is editor of the Southern Patriot. On October 5, 1963, after an 11-month investigation, SCEF's offices in New Orleans were raided by local and State police who seized a truckload of its records and arrested three of its officers, acting on the authority of the Communist Control Act. The action before the Supreme Court evolved from SCEF's efforts to recover these records. In the meantime, the Louisiana State Committee on Un-American Activities, also authorized by the act, prepared an excellent two-volume report on SCEF's activities, extensively documenting Communist involvement in the civil rights movement.

When the SCHW became the SCEF in 1948, it retained its offices, telephone, publication (the Southern Patriot, also cited as subversive), and officers, all but one of whom have been identified under oath as Communists.

Rev. Fred Shuttlesworth, a militant leftist and close colleague of Martin Luther King, is now president of SCEF, but it is for the most part operated by Carl and Anne Braden, both of whom have been identified in sworn testimony as Communists.

Mrs. Braden is editor of the Southern Patriot. On October 5, 1963, after an 11-month investigation, SCEF's offices in New Orleans were raided by local and State police who seized a truckload of its records and arrested three of its officers, acting on the authority of the Communist Control Act. The action before the Supreme Court evolved from SCEF's efforts to recover these records. In the meantime, the Louisiana State Committee on Un-American Activities, also authorized by the act, prepared an excellent two-volume report on SCEF's activities, extensively documenting Communist involvement in the civil rights movement.

HORTON BILL TO COMBAT ARAB

BOYCOTT OF ISRAEL

(Mr. HORTON asked and was given permission to extend his remarks in the body of the Record.)

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in informing my colleagues that I have introduced a bill today making it the policy of the United States to oppose restrictive trade practices or boycotts fostered or imposed by foreign countries against other countries friendly to our Nation. The purpose of this legislation is to assist American exporters defy the intimidation of the Arabs and their demands in connection with Israel trade.

For over 13 years there has existed an agreement among the various Arab States to boycott Israel, Israel goods, and all companies engaged in business arrangements—direct or indirect—with Israel. To coordinate this malicious activity, the Arab countries created the Central Arab Boycott of Israel Office, located in Damascus, Syria.

This office wages a continual war of pressure on the great number of foreign

companies that do business in the Arab world in order to prevent their undertaking similar activities in Israel. The boycott office ferrets out the names of companies engaged in commerce with Israel to compile its blacklist, a roster of those forbidden to market products or services in the Arab countries.

The boycott office operates in such a way as to make it necessary that our American Government condemn it in the strongest possible fashion. It has demanded from independent American businessmen answers to a detailed questionnaire relating to their commercial practices. This information then is used to determine whether the company goes on the blacklist.

Many of our companies have refused to yield to this blackmail. As a result, they have been denied a market in the entire Arab world. While their refusal redounds to their everlasting credit, I think we can agree that they should not be made to suffer the kind of economic discrimination which results from the fact that others may have given in to the threats of the Arabs.

There is no reason why we should not establish in the clearest and most convincing terms that the United States opposes this kind of harassment of its business firms. We also must write a positive national policy of our opposition to any and all such trade practices which are designed to intimidate countries whose feelings are friendly to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, that is the purpose of the bill I have offered. I urge Congress to move its enactment as promptly as possible.

AID'S OPERATION AS REPORTED BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BOLAND). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ERLÉNBERG) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ERLÉNBERG. Mr. Speaker, on three other occasions I have discussed the Agency for International Development's operation as reported to the Congress in studies issued by the Comptroller General.

Today I will mention a final report and, at the same time, earnestly request that the Congress direct the House Government Operations Committee to initiate an immediate investigation into all activities of AID and AID reports to the Congress.

I find this final report concerning AID most disturbing.

The Comptroller General charges the Agency for International Development with presenting misinformation and distorted reports to the Congress, and in turn to the public.

The Comptroller General's report entitled "Ineffective Utilization of Excess Personal Property Program in the Foreign Assistance Program" was issued on April 12, 1965.

The title alone should prompt careful attention on the part of the Congress because, in its 1965 budget presentation to Congress, AID reported savings of more than \$43 million in the area of excess personal property.